arXiv:1402.2437v2 [cs.DS] 19 Jan 2015

ON-LINE APPROACH TO OFF-LINE COLORING PROBLEMS ON GRAPHS WITH GEOMETRIC REPRESENTATIONS

TOMASZ KRAWCZYK AND BARTOSZ WALCZAK

Abstract. The main goal of this paper is to formalize and explore a connection between chromatic properties of graphs with geometric representations and competitive analysis of on-line algorithms, which became apparent after the recent construction of triangle-free geometric intersection graphs with arbitrarily large chromatic number due to Pawlik et al. We show that on-line graph coloring problems give rise to classes of *game graphs* with a natural geometric interpretation. We use this concept to estimate the chromatic number of graphs with geometric representations by finding, for appropriate simpler graphs, on-line coloring algorithms using few colors or proving that no such algorithms exist.

We derive upper and lower bounds on the maximum chromatic number that rectangle overlap graphs, subtree overlap graphs, and interval filament graphs (all of which generalize interval overlap graphs) can have when their clique number is bounded. The bounds are absolute for interval filament graphs and asymptotic of the form $(\log\log n)^{f(\omega)}$ for rectangle and subtree overlap graphs. In particular, we provide the first construction of geometric intersection graphs with bounded clique number and with chromatic number asymptotically greater than $\log\log n$.

We also introduce a concept of K_k-free colorings and show that for some geometric representations, the K_3-free chromatic number can be bounded in terms of the clique number although the ordinary (K_2-free) chromatic number cannot. Such a result for segment intersection graphs would imply a well-known conjecture that k-quasi-planar geometric graphs have linearly many edges.

1. Introduction

Graphs represented by geometric objects have been attracting researchers for many reasons, ranging from purely aesthetic to practical ones. A problem which has been extensively studied for this kind of graphs is that of proper coloring: given a family of objects, one wants to color them with few colors so that any two objects generating an edge of the graph obtain distinct colors. The off-line variant of the problem, in which the entire graph to be colored is known in advance, finds practical applications in areas like channel assignment, map labeling, and VLSI design. The on-line variant, in which the graph is being revealed piece by piece and the coloring agent must make irrevocable decisions without the full knowledge of it, is a common model for many scheduling problems. A natural connection between the two variants, which is discussed in this paper, allows us to establish new bounds on the chromatic number in various classes of graphs by analyzing the on-line problem in much simpler classes of graphs.

A preliminary version of this paper appeared as: Coloring relatives of interval overlap graphs via on-line games. In Javier Esparza, Pierre Fraigniaud, Thore Husfeldt, and Elias Koutsoupias, editors, *Automata, Languages, and Programming (ICALP 2014, part I)*, volume 8572 of *Lecture Notes Comput. Sci.*, pages 738–750. Springer, Berlin, 2014.

Tomasz Krawczyk was supported by Polish National Science Center grant 2011/03/B/ST6/01367. Bartosz Walczak was supported by Polish National Science Center grant 2011/03/B/ST6/01367 and by Swiss National Science Foundation grant 200020-144531.

We write χ, ω and n to denote the chromatic number, the clique number (maximum size of a clique), and the number of vertices of a graph under consideration, respectively. If $\chi = \omega$ holds for a graph G and all its induced subgraphs, then G is *perfect*. A class of graphs $\mathcal{G}$ is *χ-bounded* or *near-perfect* if there is a function $f\colon \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ such that every graph in $\mathcal{G}$ satisfies $\chi \leqslant f(\omega)$.

Geometric intersection and overlap graphs. Any finite family of sets $\mathcal{F}$ gives rise to two graphs with vertex set $\mathcal{F}$: the *intersection graph*, whose edges connect pairs of intersecting members of $\mathcal{F}$, and the *overlap graph*, whose edges connect pairs of members of $\mathcal{F}$ that *overlap*, that is, intersect but are not nested. In this paper, we do not want to distinguish isomorphic graphs, and hence we call a graph G an *intersection/overlap graph* of $\mathcal{F}$ if there is a bijective mapping $\mu\colon V(G) \to \mathcal{F}$ such that $uv \in E(G)$ if and only if $\mu(u)$ and $\mu(v)$ intersect/overlap. Depending on the context, we call the mapping μ or the family $\mathcal{F}$ an *intersection/overlap model* or *representation* of G. Ranging over all representations of a particular kind, for example, by sets with a specific geometric shape, we obtain various classes of intersection and overlap graphs. Prototypical examples are *interval graphs* and *interval overlap graphs*, which are intersection and overlap graphs, respectively, of closed intervals in $\mathbb{R}$. Interval overlap graphs are the same as *circle graphs*—intersection graphs of chords of a circle.

Interval graphs are well known to be perfect. Interval overlap graphs are no longer perfect, but they are near-perfect, which was shown by Gyárfás [15, 16]. Specifically, he proved that every interval overlap graph satisfies $\chi = O(\omega^2 4^\omega)$. This bound was improved to $\chi = O(\omega^2 2^\omega)$ by Kostochka [19], and further to $\chi = O(2^\omega)$ by Kostochka and Kratochvíl [21]. Currently the best lower bound on the maximum chromatic number of an interval overlap graph with clique number ω is $\Omega(\omega \log \omega)$, due to Kostochka [19]. The exponential gap between the best known upper and lower bounds remains open for almost 30 years.

An overlap model is *clean* if it has no three sets such that two overlapping ones both contain the third one. An overlap graph is *clean* if it has a clean overlap model. The assumption that an overlap graph is clean can help in finding a proper coloring of it with few colors. For example, Kostochka and Milans [22] proved that clean interval overlap graphs satisfy $\chi \leqslant 2\omega - 1$.

Intervals in $\mathbb{R}$ are naturally generalized by axis-parallel rectangles in $\mathbb{R}^2$ and by subtrees of a tree, which give rise to the following classes of graphs:

- *chordal graphs*—intersection graphs of subtrees of a tree, originally defined as graphs containing no induced cycles of length greater than three, see [12],
- *subtree overlap graphs*—overlap graphs of subtrees of a tree, introduced in [13],
- *rectangle graphs*—intersection graphs of axis-parallel rectangles in the plane,
- *rectangle overlap graphs*—overlap graphs of axis-parallel rectangles in the plane.

Chordal graphs are perfect. Rectangle graphs are near-perfect: Asplund and Grünbaum [3] showed that they satisfy $\chi = O(\omega^2)$. Kostochka [20] claimed the existence of rectangle graphs with chromatic number 3ω. Rectangle overlap graphs are no longer near-perfect: Pawlik et al. [27] presented a construction of triangle-free rectangle overlap graphs with chromatic number $\Theta(\log \log n)$. This construction works also for a variety of other geometric intersection graphs [27, 28] and is used in all known counterexamples to a conjecture of Scott on graphs with an excluded induced subdivision [6]. Actually, it produces graphs that we call *interval overlap game graphs*, which

form a subclass of rectangle overlap graphs, segment intersection graphs, and subtree overlap graphs. This implies that subtree overlap graphs are not near-perfect either. Interval overlap game graphs play an important role in this paper, but their definition requires some preparation, so it is postponed until Section 6. It is proved in [23] that triangle-free rectangle overlap graphs have chromatic number $O(\log\log n)$, which matches the above-mentioned lower bound. It is worth noting that intersection graphs of axis-parallel boxes in $\mathbb{R}^3$ are not near-perfect either. Burling [5] constructed such graphs with no triangles and with chromatic number $\Theta(\log\log n)$. We reproduce Burling's construction in Section 3.

Interval filament graphs are intersection graphs of *interval filaments*, which are continuous non-negative functions defined on closed intervals with value zero on the endpoints. They were introduced in [13] as a generalization of interval overlap graphs, polygon-circle graphs, chordal graphs and co-comparability graphs. Every interval filament graph is a subtree overlap graph [8], and the overlap graph of any collection of subtrees of a tree T intersecting a common path in T is an interval filament graph [8]. We comment more on this in Section 6. An interval filament graph is *domain-non-overlapping* if it has an intersection representation by interval filaments whose domains are pairwise non-overlapping intervals.

Outerstring graphs are intersection graphs of curves in a halfplane with one endpoint on the boundary of the halfplane. Every interval filament graph is an outerstring graph.

String graphs are intersection graphs of arbitrary curves in the plane. Every graph of any class considered above is a string graph. For example, a rectangle overlap graph can be represented as an intersection graph of boundaries of rectangles, and the overlap graph of a family of subtrees of a tree T can be represented as the intersection graph of closed curves encompassing these subtrees in a planar drawing of T. The best known upper bound on the chromatic number of string graphs is $(\log n)^{O(\log\omega)}$ due to Fox and Pach [11].

The following diagram illustrates the inclusions between most of the classes defined above:



Results. Here is the summary of the results of this paper. In what follows, we write O_ω and Θ_ω to denote the asymptotics with ω fixed as a constant.

Theorem 1.1.
(1) *Every interval filament graph satisfies* $\chi = O\big(2^\omega\binom{\omega+1}{2}\big)$.
(2) *Every domain-non-overlapping interval filament graph satisfies* $\chi \leqslant \binom{\omega+1}{2}$.
(3) *There are domain-non-overlapping interval filament graphs with* $\chi = \binom{\omega+1}{2}$.

Theorem 1.2.
(1) *Every subtree overlap graph safisfies* $\chi = O_\omega((\log\log n)^{\binom{\omega}{2}})$.

(2) *Every clean subtree overlap graph satisfies* $\chi = O_\omega((\log\log n)^{\omega-1})$.
(3) *There are clean subtree overlap graphs with* $\chi = \Theta_\omega((\log\log n)^{\omega-1})$. *Consequently, there are string graphs with* $\chi = \Theta_\omega((\log\log n)^{\omega-1})$.

Theorem 1.3.
(1) *Every rectangle overlap graph satisfies* $\chi = O_\omega((\log\log n)^{\omega-1})$.
(2) *Every clean rectangle overlap graph satisfies* $\chi = O_\omega(\log\log n)$.

Theorem 1.3 for $\omega = 2$ was proved in [23]. The construction of triangle-free rectangle overlap graphs with chromatic number $\Theta(\log\log n)$ due to Pawlik et al. [27] mentioned before shows that the bound of Theorem 1.3 (2) is asymptotically tight. It also implies Theorem 1.2 (3) for $\omega = 2$, which we comment on in Section 6. Theorem 1.2 (3) provides the first construction of string graphs with bounded clique number and with chromatic number asymptotically greater than $\log\log n$.

Theorem 1.1 (1) asserts in particular that interval filament graphs are χ-bounded. This is also implied by a very recent result of Rok and Walczak [30] that outerstring graphs are χ-bounded, which is proved using different techniques leading to an enormous bound on the chromatic number. The χ-boundedness of interval filament graphs implies that they form a *proper* subclass of subtree overlap graphs, as the latter are not χ-bounded. It seems that the proper inclusion between these two classes was not known before.

A *K_k-free coloring* of a graph G is a coloring of the vertices of G such that every color class induces a K_k-free subgraph of G. A K_2-free coloring is just a proper coloring. The *K_k-free chromatic number*, denoted by χ_k, is the minimum number of colors sufficient for a K_k-free coloring of the graph. Our interest in K_k-free colorings comes from an attempt to prove the so-called *quasi-planar graph conjecture*, which is discussed at the end of this section. The proof of Theorem 1.3 (2) gives the following as a byproduct.

Theorem 1.4. *Every clean rectangle overlap graph satisfies* $\chi_3 = O_\omega(1)$.

On the other hand, Theorem 1.2 (2)–(3) implies that for every $k \geqslant 2$, there are clean subtree overlap graphs (and thus string graphs) with $\omega = k$ and $\chi_k = \Theta_k(\log\log n)$.

The proofs of the upper bounds in Theorems 1.1–1.4 are constructive—they can be used to design polynomial-time algorithms that produce a proper coloring with the claimed number of colors. These algorithms require the input graph to be provided together with its geometric representation. Constructing a representation is at least as hard as deciding whether a representation exists (the recognition problem), which is NP-complete for interval filament graphs [29], and whose complexity is unknown for subtree overlap graphs (see [7] for partial results) and rectangle overlap graphs.

Methods. All our proofs heavily depend on the correspondence between on-line graph coloring problems and off-line colorings of so-called *game graphs*, which originates from considerations in [23, 27] and which we formalize in the next section. It allows us to reduce the problems of estimating the maximum possible chromatic number in classes of geometric intersection graphs to designing coloring algorithms or adversary strategies for the on-line coloring problem in much simpler classes of graphs. This approach is the only one known to give upper bounds better than single logarithmic (with respect to n) on the chromatic number in those classes of string graphs with bounded clique number that do not allow a constant bound.

In Section 3, we illustrate the concept of game graphs on two short examples. First, we construct rectangle graphs with chromatic number $3\omega - 2$, which is only less by 2

than Kostochka's claimed but unpublished lower bound of 3ω. Second, we reproduce Burling's construction of triangle-free intersection graphs of axis-parallel boxes in $\mathbb{R}^3$ with $\chi = \Theta(\log\log n)$. Later sections contain the proofs of Theorems 1.1–1.4.

The proof of Theorem 1.1 relies on a result of Felsner [10] which determines exactly the competitivity of the on-line coloring problem on incomparability graphs of up-growing partial orders. The proofs of Theorems 1.2 and 1.3 rely on the algorithm and the adversary strategy for the on-line coloring problem on forests. A well-known adversary strategy due to Bean [4], later rediscovered by Gyárfás and Lehel [17], forces any on-line coloring algorithm to use at least c colors on a forest with at most 2^{c-1} vertices. This lower bound is tightly matched by the algorithm called First-fit, discussed in Section 7, which colors every n-vertex forest on-line using at most $\lfloor \log_2 n \rfloor + 1$ colors. A reduction to on-line coloring of forests is a final step in the proofs of Theorem 1.2 (2) and Theorem 1.3 (2). The adversary strategy used in the proof of Theorem 1.2 (3), presented in Section 8, can be viewed as a generalization of the above-mentioned adversary strategy of Bean for forests.

An important ingredient in the proofs of Theorem 1.2 (1) and Theorem 1.3 (1) is a generalized breadth-first search procedure, which we call the *k-clique breadth-first search* and which may be of independent interest. It allows us to reduce the respective coloring problem to clean overlap graphs in a similar way as the ordinary breadth-first search does for the case $\omega = 2$ [15, 23]. This is discussed in detail in Section 5.

Further work. The following problem, posed in [28], remains open: estimate (asymptotically) the maximum possible chromatic number with respect to the number of vertices for triangle-free segment intersection graphs, or more generally, segment intersection graphs with bounded clique number. We believe the answer is $\Theta_\omega((\log\log n)^c)$ for some constant $c \geqslant 1$. For the analogous problem for string graphs, we believe the answer is $\Theta_\omega((\log\log n)^{f(\omega)})$ for some function $f(\omega) \geqslant \omega - 1$. The first step of the proof of Theorem 1.3 (2) is a reduction from clean rectangle overlap graphs to interval overlap game graphs (see Lemma 6.1). The main challenge in applying the on-line approach to the problems above lies in devising an analogous reduction from segment or string graphs to game graphs of an appropriate on-line graph coloring problem.

An exciting open problem related to geometric intersection graphs concerns the number of edges in k-quasi-planar graphs. A graph drawn in the plane is *k-quasi-planar* if no k edges cross each other in the drawing. Pach, Shahrokhi and Szegedy [26] conjectured that k-quasi-planar graphs have $O_k(n)$ edges. For $k = 2$, this asserts the well-known fact that planar graphs have $O(n)$ edges. The conjecture is also proved for $k = 3$ [2, 25] and $k = 4$ [1], but it is open for $k \geqslant 5$. If we can prove that the intersection graph of the edges of a k-quasi-planar graph G satisfies $\chi_3 = O_k(1)$ ($\chi_4 = O_k(1)$), then it will follow that G has $O_k(n)$ edges, as each color class in a K_3-free (K_4-free) coloring of G is itself a 3-quasi-planar (4-quasi-planar) graph and therefore has $O(n)$ edges. The construction of triangle-free segment intersection graphs with arbitrarily large chromatic number implies that such an approach cannot succeed when we ask for a proper coloring of the edges. In view of the remark after Theorem 1.4, it cannot succeed for K_k-free colorings either when the edges of G are allowed to cross arbitrarily many times. Nevertheless, Theorem 1.4 suggests that there can be a substantial difference between proper and triangle-free colorings of geometric intersection graphs, which makes this approach appealing for k-quasi-planar graphs whose edges are drawn as straight-line segments or 1-intersecting curves.

Finally, it can be an interesting challenge to close the asymptotic gap between the upper bounds of $O_\omega((\log\log n)^{\binom{\omega}{2}})$ and $O_\omega((\log\log n)^{\omega-1})$ and the lower bounds of $\Omega_\omega((\log\log n)^{\omega-1})$ and $\Omega(\log\log n)$, respectively, on the maximum chromatic number of subtree and rectangle overlap graphs. We believe that the lower bounds are correct. A similar problem is to prove the analogue of Theorem 1.4 for rectangle overlap graphs that are not clean.

2. On-line graph coloring games and game graphs

The *on-line graph coloring game* is played by two deterministic players: Presenter and Algorithm. It is played in rounds. In each round, Presenter introduces a new vertex of the graph and declares whether or not it has an edge to each of the vertices presented before. Then, in the same round, Algorithm colors this vertex keeping the property that the coloring is proper. Imposing additional restrictions on Presenter's moves gives rise to many possible variants of the on-line graph coloring game. Typical kinds of such restrictions look as follows:

(i) Presenter builds a graph G that belongs to a specific class of graphs.
(ii) Presenter builds a mapping $\mu\colon V(G) \to \mathcal{C}$ called a *representation* of G in some class of objects $\mathcal{C}$, and the edges of G are defined from μ.
(iii) Presenter builds relations $R_1, \ldots, R_r$ on $V(G)$, and the edges of G are defined from $R_1, \ldots, R_r$.
(iv) There can be some restrictions relating μ, $R_1, \ldots, R_r$, and the order in which the vertices are presented.

The decisions of both players are irrevocable. That is, Presenter cannot change the graph, the representation or the relations once they have been set, and Algorithm cannot change the colors once they have been assigned. The goal of Algorithm is to keep using as few colors as possible, while Presenter wants to force Algorithm to use as many colors as possible. The *value* of such a game is the minimum number c such that Algorithm has a strategy to color any graph that can be presented using at most c colors, or equivalently, the maximum number c such that Presenter has a strategy to force Algorithm to use at least c colors regardless of how Algorithm responds.

We call any variant of the on-line graph coloring game simply an *on-line game*, and any coloring strategy of Algorithm simply an *on-line algorithm*. We denote by $\prec$ the order in which the vertices are presented. It is envisioned as going from left to right.

Now, we explain the crucial concept of our paper—game graphs. Let G be an on-line game with representation μ in a class $\mathcal{C}$ and relations $R_1, \ldots, R_r$. Any graph G with a representation $\mu\colon V(G) \to \mathcal{C}$, relations $R_1, \ldots, R_r$ on $V(G)$, and an order $\prec$ on $V(G)$ that can possibly be presented in n rounds of G in such a way that $\prec$ is the order of presentation is an *n-round presentation scenario* in G. We define the class of *game graphs* associated with G as follows. A graph G is a *game graph* of G if there exist a rooted forest F on $V(G)$, a mapping $\mu\colon V(G) \to \mathcal{C}$, and relations $R_1, \ldots, R_r$ on $V(G)$ such that

(a) for every $v \in V(G)$, the subgraph $G[V(P_v)]$ of G induced on the vertices of the path P_v in F from a root to v, the representation μ restricted to $V(P_v)$, the relations $R_1, \ldots, R_r$ restricted to $V(P_v)$, and the order $\prec$ of vertices along P_v give a valid $|V(P_v)|$-round presentation scenario in G,
(b) if $uv \in E(G)$, then u is an ancestor of v or v is an ancestor of u in F.

For two distinct vertices u and v of a game graph, we write $u \prec v$ to denote that u is an ancestor of v in F. Therefore, the relations $\prec$ in the on-line game and in the game graph correspond to each other in the same way as $R_1, \ldots, R_r$. A game graph can be envisioned as a union of several presentation scenarios in which some (not necessarily all) common prefixes of these scenarios have been identified.

All the games that we will consider are closed under taking induced subgraphs, in the sense that any induced subgraph of any presentation scenario (with the representation, the relations, and the order $\prec$ restricted to the vertices of the subgraph) is again a valid presentation scenario. It easily follows from the definition that the game graphs of such games are also closed under taking induced subgraphs.

It follows from (b) that $\omega(G) = \max\{\omega(G[V(P_v)]) \colon v \in V(G)\}$. In particular, if one of the restrictions on the game G requires that the presented graph has clique number at most k, then all game graphs of G also have clique number at most k.

Lemma 2.1. *If there is an on-line algorithm using at most c colors in an on-line game G, then every game graph of G has chromatic number at most c.*

Proof. Intuitively, to color a game graph properly, it is enough to run the on-line algorithm on the subgraph induced on every path in F from a root to a leaf.

More formally, let G be a game graph of G with underlying forest F, representation μ and relations $R_1, \ldots, R_r$. For every $u \in V(G)$, the condition (a) of the definition of a game graph gives us a presentation scenario of the graph $G[V(P_u)]$. Color the vertex u in G with the color assigned to u by Algorithm in this scenario. For every descendant v of u in F, the presentation scenario of $G[V(P_u)]$ is the initial part of the presentation scenario of $G[V(P_v)]$ up to the point when u is presented, so Algorithm assigns the same color to u in both scenarios. Therefore, since Algorithm colors every $G[V(P_v)]$ properly, the coloring of G defined this way is also proper. □

We say that a strategy of Presenter in an on-line game G is *finite* if the total number of presentation scenarios that can occur in the game when Presenter plays according to this strategy, for all possible responses of Algorithm, is finite.

Lemma 2.2. *If Presenter has a finite strategy to force Algorithm to use at least c colors in an on-line game G, then there exists a game graph of G with chromatic number at least c. Moreover, the number of vertices of this graph is equal to the total number of presentation scenarios that can occur with this strategy.*

Proof. Consider a finite strategy of Presenter forcing Algorithm to use at least k colors in G. Let S be the set of presentation scenarios that can occur when Presenter plays according to this strategy. Hence, S is finite. Define a forest F on S so that

- if $s \in S$ is a scenario that presents only one vertex, then s is a root of F,
- otherwise, the parent of s in F is the scenario with one vertex less, describing the situation of the game before the last vertex is presented in the scenario s.

For a scenario $s \in S$, let $v(s)$ denote the last vertex presented in the scenario s. We define a graph G on S so that $s_1 s_2$ is an edge of G if s_1 is an ancestor of s_2 and $v(s_1)v(s_2)$ is an edge in the graph presented in the scenario s_2 or vice versa. We define relations $R_1, \ldots, R_r$ on S in the same way: $s_1 \; R_i \; s_2$ if s_1 is an ancestor of s_2 and $v(s_1) \; R_i \; v(s_2)$ in the scenario s_2 or vice versa. Finally, for $s \in S$, we define $\mu(s) = \mu(v(s))$ in the scenario s. It clearly follows that the graph G thus obtained is a game graph of G with underlying forest F, representation μ and relations $R_1, \ldots, R_r$.

It remains to prove that $\chi(G) \geqslant c$. Suppose to the contrary that there is a proper coloring of G using $c-1$ colors. Consider the following strategy of Algorithm against Presenter's considered strategy in G. When a new vertex is presented, Algorithm looks at the presentation scenario s of the structure presented so far. Since Presenter is assumed to play according to the strategy that gives rise to the game graph G, the scenario s is a vertex of G. Algorithm colors the new vertex $v(s)$ in the game with the color of s in the assumed coloring of G using $c-1$ colors. This way, Algorithm uses only $c-1$ colors against Presenter's considered strategy, which contradicts the assumption that this strategy forces Algorithm to use at least c colors. □

Here is how Lemmas 2.1 and 2.2 are typically used. To provide an upper bound on the chromatic number of graphs of some class $\mathcal{G}$, we show that each graph in $\mathcal{G}$ is a game graph of an appropriately chosen on-line game, and we find an on-line algorithm in this game using few colors. To construct graphs of some class $\mathcal{G}$ with large chromatic number, we show that every game graph of an appropriately chosen on-line game belongs to $\mathcal{G}$, and we find a finite strategy of Presenter in this game forcing Algorithm to use many colors.

We use this approach to prove the results of the paper. First, we reduce Theorems 1.1–1.4 to claims about game graphs of appropriately chosen on-line games. Then, to prove these claims, we devise strategies for Algorithm and Presenter in these games and apply Lemmas 2.1 and 2.2 accordingly.

3. Two simple examples

In order to illustrate the concept developed in the previous section, we prove the following.

Proposition 3.1. *There are rectangle graphs with chromatic number* $3\omega - 2$.

Let $\mathcal{I}$ denote the set of all closed intervals in $\mathbb{R}$. Consider an on-line game $\mathsf{INT}(k)$ on the class of interval graphs with clique number at most k presented with their interval representation. That is, Presenter builds an interval graph G and a representation $\mu\colon V(G) \to \mathcal{I}$ so that

(i) μ is the intersection model of G, that is, $uv \in E(G)$ if and only if $\mu(u) \cap \mu(v) \neq \emptyset$,
(ii) $\omega(G) \leqslant k$,

and Algorithm properly colors G on-line. For this game, the definition of a game graph comes down to the following: a graph G is a game graph of $\mathsf{INT}(k)$ if there exist a rooted forest F on $V(G)$ and a mapping $\mu\colon V(G) \to \mathcal{I}$ such that

(a) for every $v \in V(G)$ and the path P_v in F from a root to v, the following holds:
  (i) μ restricted to $V(P_v)$ is the intersection model of $G[V(P_v)]$,
  (ii) $\omega(G[V(P_v)]) \leqslant k$,
(b) if $uv \in E(G)$, then u is an ancestor of v or v is an ancestor of u in F.

Recall that the ancestor-descendant order of F is denoted by $\prec$. The above can be simplified to the following two conditions, corresponding to the two conditions in the definition of the game $\mathsf{INT}(k)$:

(i) $uv \in E(G)$ if and only if $u \prec v$ or $v \prec u$ and $\mu(u) \cap \mu(v) \neq \emptyset$,
(ii) $\omega(G) \leqslant k$.

Now, we derive Proposition 3.1 from a known result about the game $\mathsf{INT}(k)$.



FIGURE 1. A strategy of Presenter forcing 3 colors in the game $\mathsf{INT}(2)$. In the first two rounds, Presenter introduces two disjoint intervals. Depending on whether they are colored with two different colors or with the same color, Presenter forces a third color in the next one or two rounds, respectively. The five presentation scenarios $s_1, \ldots, s_5$ which can occur in the game when Presenter follows this strategy form a game graph of $\mathsf{INT}(2)$, illustrated as an abstract graph (on the left) and with intervals representing vertices (on the right).

Theorem 3.2 (Kierstead, Trotter [18])**.** *The value of the game* $\mathsf{INT}(k)$ *is* $3k-2$*. In particular, Presenter has a finite strategy to force Algorithm to use* $3k-2$ *colors in the game* $\mathsf{INT}(k)$*.*

Proof of Proposition 3.1. By Theorem 3.2 and Lemma 2.2, there are game graphs of $\mathsf{INT}(k)$ with chromatic number $3k-2$. See Figure 1 for an illustration. It remains to show that every game graph of $\mathsf{INT}(k)$ has an intersection representation by axis-parallel rectangles.

Let G be a game graph of $\mathsf{INT}(k)$ with underlying forest F on $V(G)$ and representation $\mu\colon V(G) \to \mathcal{I}$. For $u \in V(G)$, let $F(u)$ denote the set of vertices of the subtree of F rooted at u, including u. We run depth-first search on F and record, for each $u \in V(G)$, the times $x_u, y_u \in \mathbb{Z}$ at which the search enters and leaves $F(u)$, respectively. It follows that

- $x_u < y_u$ for every $u \in V(G)$,
- if $v \in F(u) \setminus \{u\}$, then $x_u < x_v < y_v < y_u$,
- if $v \notin F(u)$ and $u \notin F(v)$, then $[x_u, y_u] \cap [x_v, y_v] = \emptyset$.

For every vertex $u \in V(G)$, we define a rectangle $R_u \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ as $R_u = \mu(u) \times [x_u, y_u]$ (see Figure 2). We show that the mapping $u \mapsto R_u$ is an intersection model of G.

Fix $u, v \in V(G)$. If $v \in F(u)$ or $u \in F(v)$, then $[x_v, y_v] \subset [x_u, y_u]$ or $[x_u, y_u] \subset [x_v, y_v]$, respectively; hence, R_u and R_v intersect if and only if $\mu(u)$ and $\mu(v)$ intersect, that is, if and only if $uv \in E(G)$. If $v \notin F(u)$ and $u \notin F(v)$, so that $uv \notin E(G)$, then $[x_u, y_u] \cap [x_v, y_v] = \emptyset$, and thus $R_u \cap R_v = \emptyset$. This shows that $u \mapsto R_u$ is indeed an intersection model of G. □



FIGURE 2. Representation of a game graph of $\mathsf{INT}(2)$ as an intersection graph of axis-parallel rectangles.

In an analogous way, we can reprove the result of Burling [5] that there exist triangle-free intersection graphs of axis-parallel boxes in $\mathbb{R}^3$ with chromatic number $\Theta(\log\log n)$. To this end, we use the result of Erlebach and Fiala [9] that Presenter can force the use of arbitrarily many colors in the on-line coloring game on the class of triangle-free rectangle graphs presented with their representation by axis-parallel rectangles. Their strategy (a geometric realization of the strategy for forests mentioned in the introduction) forces the use of c colors in 2^{c-1} rounds with $2^{2^{O(c)}}$ presentation scenarios. Hence, Lemma 2.2 gives us a triangle-free game graph with chromatic number c and with $2^{2^{O(c)}}$ vertices. The same argument as in the proof of Proposition 3.1, using an additional dimension to encode the branching structure of the game graph, shows that this graph is an intersection graph of axis-parallel boxes in $\mathbb{R}^3$. The graphs obtained this way are the same as the graphs constructed by Burling and isomorphic to the triangle-free rectangle overlap graphs with chromatic number $\Theta(\log\log n)$ constructed in [27].

4. Interval filament graphs

This section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.1. Let $\mathrm{dom}(f)$ denote the domain of an interval filament f, that is, the closed interval on which the function f is defined. We will assume without loss of generality that in any interval filament intersection model, the domains are in general position, that is, no two of their endpoints coincide.

The following lemma allows us to reduce the general problem of coloring interval filament graphs to the problem for domain-non-overlapping interval filament graphs.

Lemma 4.1. *The vertices of every interval filament graph can be partitioned into $O(2^\omega)$ classes so that the subgraph induced on each class is a domain-non-overlapping interval filament graph.*

Proof. Let G be a graph with an interval filament intersection model $u \mapsto f_u$. Let G' be the subgraph of G with $V(G') = V(G)$ such that $uv \in E(G')$ if and only if $\mathrm{dom}(f_u)$ and $\mathrm{dom}(f_v)$ overlap. It follows that G' is an interval overlap graph with overlap model $u \mapsto \mathrm{dom}(f_u)$. Since $\omega(G') \leqslant \omega(G)$, the result of [21] implies that G' can be properly colored using $O(2^{\omega(G)})$ colors. Clearly, the model $u \mapsto f_u$ restricted to each color class consists of interval filaments with non-overlapping domains. □

The *incomparability graph* of a partial order $<$ on a set P is the graph with vertex set P and edge set consisting of pairs of $<$-incomparable elements of P. A graph G is a *co-comparability graph* if it is the incomparability graph of some partial order on $V(G)$. Consider an on-line game $\mathsf{COCO}(k)$ on the class of co-comparability graphs with clique number at most k presented with their order relation in the *up-growing* manner. That is, Presenter builds a co-comparability graph G presenting a partial order $<$ on $V(G)$ and defining, in each round, the relation $<$ between the new vertex and the vertices presented before so that

(i) G is the incomparability graph of the order $<$,
(ii) every vertex of G is maximal in the order $<$ at the moment it is presented,
(iii) $\omega(G) \leqslant k$, that is, the width of the order $<$ is at most k,

and Algorithm properly colors G on-line.

Lemma 4.2. *A graph G is a game graph of $\mathsf{COCO}(k)$ if and only if G is a domain-non-overlapping interval filament graph and $\omega(G) \leqslant k$.*

Proof. Let G be a graph with a domain-non-overlapping interval filament intersection model $u \mapsto f_u$ and with $\omega(G) \leqslant k$. The inclusion order on the domains of the interval filaments f_u defines a forest F on $V(G)$ so that for each $v \in V(G)$,

- if there is no $u \in V(G)$ such that $\mathrm{dom}(f_u) \supset \mathrm{dom}(f_v)$, then v is a root of F,
- otherwise, the parent of v in F is the unique $u \in V(G)$ such that $\mathrm{dom}(f_u) \supset \mathrm{dom}(f_v)$ and $\mathrm{dom}(f_u)$ is minimal with this property.

It follows that u is an ancestor of v in F if and only if $\mathrm{dom}(f_u) \supset \mathrm{dom}(f_v)$. We define a relation $<$ on $V(G)$ so that $u < v$ if and only if $\mathrm{dom}(f_u) \supset \mathrm{dom}(f_v)$ and $f_u \cap f_v = \emptyset$. Consider the path P_v in F from a root to a vertex v. The graph $G[V(P_v)]$, the order $<$ restricted to $V(P_v)$, and the order $\prec$ of vertices along P_v form a valid $|V(P_v)|$-round presentation scenario in $\mathsf{COCO}(k)$. Indeed, the condition (i) of $\mathsf{COCO}(k)$ holds, because if $u \prec v$, then $\mathrm{dom}(f_u) \supset \mathrm{dom}(f_v)$, so $u < v$ if and only if $uv \notin E(G)$; (ii) holds, because if $u < v$, then $\mathrm{dom}(f_u) \supset \mathrm{dom}(f_v)$, so $u \prec v$; and (iii) follows from the assumption that $\omega(G) \leqslant k$. Moreover, if $uv \in E(G)$, then $f_u \cap f_v \neq \emptyset$, which implies $\mathrm{dom}(f_u) \subset \mathrm{dom}(f_v)$ or $\mathrm{dom}(f_u) \supset \mathrm{dom}(f_v)$, by the assumption that the model $u \mapsto f_u$ is domain-non-overlapping. Hence, if $uv \in E(G)$, then u is an ancestor of v or v is an ancestor of u. This shows that G is indeed a game graph of $\mathsf{COCO}(k)$.

For the converse implication, we use a result due to Golumbic, Rotem and Urrutia [14] and Lovász [24], which asserts that every partial order is isomorphic to the order $<$ on some family of continuous functions $[0,1] \to (0,\infty)$, where $f < g$ means that $f(x) < g(x)$ for every $x \in [0,1]$. Let G be a game graph of $\mathsf{COCO}(k)$ with underlying forest F and relation $<$. For $u \in V(G)$, let $F(u)$ denote the set of vertices of the subtree of F rooted at u, including u itself. As in the proof of Proposition 3.1, we use depth-first search to compute, for each $u \in V(G)$, numbers $x_u, y_u \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that

- $x_u < y_u$ for every $u \in V(G)$,



FIGURE 3. Top: A strategy of Presenter forcing 3 colors in 4 rounds of the game $\mathsf{COCO}(2)$. If a, b, c receive distinct colors, then Presenter wins in 3 rounds. Otherwise, the color of c is the same as the color of a or b, and depending on Algorithm's choice, Presenter forces a 3rd color in the 4th round. Bottom: A domain-non-overlapping interval filament model of the game graph arising from the strategy on the top.

- if $v \in F(u) \setminus \{u\}$, then $x_u < x_v < y_v < y_u$,
- if $v \notin F(u)$ and $u \notin F(v)$, then $[x_u, y_u] \cap [x_v, y_v] = \emptyset$.

Let L denote the set of leaves of F, and let $L(u) = L \cap F(u)$ for $u \in V(G)$. For $v \in L$, let P_v denote the path in F from a root to v. The graph $G[V(P_v)]$ is the incomparability graph of the order $<$ restricted to $V(P_v)$. Hence, by the above-mentioned result of [14, 24], it has an intersection representation by continuous functions $[x_v, y_v] \to (0, \infty)$. Specifically, every vertex $u \in V(P_v)$ can be assigned a continuous function $f_{u,v} \colon [x_v, y_v] \to (0, \infty)$ so that $u_1 < u_2$ if and only if $f_{u_1,v} > f_{u_2,v}$ for any $u_1, u_2 \in V(P_v)$ (note that the order is reversed). Now, for every vertex $u \in V(G)$, we define an interval filament f_u as the union of the following curves:

- the functions $f_{u,v}$ for all $v \in L(u)$,
- the segment connecting points $(x_u - \frac{1}{3}, 0)$ and $(x_v, f_{u,v}(x_v))$ for the first leaf $v \in L(u)$ in the depth-first search order,
- the segments connecting points $(y_{v_1}, f_{u,v_1}(y_{v_1}))$ and $(x_{v_2}, f_{u,v_2}(x_{v_2}))$ for any two leaves $v_1, v_2 \in L(u)$ consecutive in the depth-first search order,
- the segment connecting points $(y_v, f_{u,v}(y_v))$ and $(y_u + \frac{1}{3}, 0)$ for the last leaf $v \in L(u)$ in the depth-first search order.

It follows that $\mathrm{dom}(f_u) = [x_u - \frac{1}{3}, y_u + \frac{1}{3}]$ for every $u \in V(G)$ and thus the domains of the interval filaments f_u do not overlap.

It remains to prove that $u \mapsto f_u$ is an intersection model of G. Fix $u, v \in V(G)$. First, suppose $v \in F(u)$ and $u < v$, so that $uv \notin E(G)$. By the definition of f_u and f_v, we have $\mathrm{dom}(f_u) \supset \mathrm{dom}(f_v)$, and f_u lies entirely above f_v. Therefore, $f_u \cap f_v = \emptyset$. Now, suppose $v \in F(u)$ and $u \not< v$. We also have $v \not< u$, by the condition (ii) of the

definition of $\mathsf{COCO}(k)$. Hence $uv \in E(G)$. For any leaf $w \in L(v)$, the functions $f_{u,w}$ and $f_{v,w}$ intersect, so $f_u \cap f_v \neq \emptyset$. The case that $u \in F(v)$ is analogous. Finally, suppose $u \notin F(v)$ and $v \notin F(u)$, so that $uv \notin E(G)$. It follows that $[x_u, y_u] \cap [x_v, y_v] = \emptyset$, so $\mathrm{dom}(f_u) \cap \mathrm{dom}(f_v) = \emptyset$. Therefore, $f_u \cap f_v = \emptyset$. This shows that $u \mapsto f_u$ is indeed an intersection model of G. See Figure 3 for an illustration. □

Theorem 4.3 (Felsner [10])**.** *The value of the game* $\mathsf{COCO}(k)$ *is* $\binom{k+1}{2}$*. That is, there is an on-line coloring algorithm using at most* $\binom{k+1}{2}$ *colors, and there is a finite strategy of Presenter forcing Algorithm to use* $\binom{k+1}{2}$ *colors in* $\mathsf{COCO}(k)$*.*

Theorem 1.1 (2)–(3) follows from Theorem 4.3, Lemma 4.2, and Lemmas 2.1 and 2.2 (respectively). Theorem 1.1 (1) follows from Theorem 1.1 (2) and Lemma 4.1.

5. Reduction to clean overlap graphs

The goal of this section is to establish the following reduction of the general problem of coloring overlap graphs to the problem for clean overlap graphs.

Theorem 5.1. *Let G be an overlap graph. If every clean induced subgraph H of G with $\omega(H) \leqslant j$ satisfies $\chi(H) \leqslant \alpha_j$ for $2 \leqslant j \leqslant \omega(G)$, then $\chi(G) \leqslant \prod_{j=2}^{\omega(G)} 2\alpha_j$.*

It is proved in [23] that every triangle-free overlap graph can be partitioned into two clean graphs: the union of odd levels and the union of even levels in the breadth-first search forest. This proves Theorem 5.1 for graphs with clique number at most 2. However, such a simple partition is insufficient for graphs with clique number greater than 2. We use a generalization of breadth-first search, which we call *k-clique breadth-first search*. We present the algorithm first, and then we discuss its properties.

Algorithm k-clique breadth-first search
input : a graph G with vertices ordered as $v_1, \ldots, v_n$
output: a partition of $\{v_1, \ldots, v_n\}$ into sets L_d with $d \geqslant 0$

$V := \{v_1, \ldots, v_n\}$; $d := 0$;
while $V \neq \emptyset$ **do**
  if there is a k-clique K with $|K \cap V| = 1$ **then**
    $L_d := \{v_j \in V$: there is a k-clique K with $K \cap V = \{v_j\}\}$;
  else
    choose $v_i \in V$ with the minimum index i;
    $L_d := \{v_i\}$;
  $V := V \setminus L_d$; $d := d + 1$;

See Figure 4 for an illustration of the algorithm. It is clear that it stops and runs in time polynomial in n (for fixed k). The 2-clique breadth-first search is just the ordinary breadth-first search: every connected component of G is the union of some consecutive sets $L_d, \ldots, L_{d+t}$, of which L_{d+i} is the set of vertices at distance i from the vertex with the minimum index in that connected component. The following two properties of the k-clique breadth-first search generalize those of the ordinary breadth-first search.

Lemma 5.2. *Let L_d be the sets computed by the k-clique breadth-first search on a graph G. It follows that every k-clique in G has two of its vertices in one set L_d or in two consecutive sets L_d and L_{d+1}.*



FIGURE 4. An illustration of the 3-clique breadth-first search applied to the rectangle overlap graph above. The sets L_1, L_2, L_6 and L_8 are defined by executing the **else** statement of the main loop.

Proof. Let K be a k-clique in G. Let L_d be the set such that $|K \cap V| \geqslant 2$ before and $|K \cap V| \leqslant 1$ after the algorithm performs the assignment $V := V \setminus L_d$. It follows that $K \cap L_d \neq \emptyset$. If $|K \cap L_d| \geqslant 2$, then L_d satisfies the conclusion of the lemma. If $|K \cap L_d| = 1$, then $|K \cap V| = 1$ after the assignment $V := V \setminus L_d$, so the vertex remaining in $K \cap V$ will be taken to L_{d+1} in the next iteration of the algorithm, which yields $K \cap L_{d+1} \neq \emptyset$. □

Lemma 5.3. *Let G be an overlap graph with overlap model μ, with vertices $v_1, \ldots, v_n$ ordered so that $\mu(v_i) \not\subset \mu(v_j)$ for $i < j$, and with $\omega(G) \leqslant k$. It follows that every set L_d computed by the k-clique breadth-first search on G induces a clean subgraph of G.*

Proof. First, we show the following:

$(*)$ if $v_i \in L_d$, $v_r \in L_{d'}$, and $\mu(v_r) \subset \mu(v_i)$, then $d \leqslant d'$.

Let $v_i \in L_d$, let d' be the minimum index such that $L_{d'}$ contains a vertex v_r with $\mu(v_r) \subset \mu(v_i)$, and suppose to the contrary that $d' < d$. Consider the set V at the point when the algorithm computes $L_{d'}$. It follows that $v_i, v_r \in V$. If there was no k-clique K with $|K \cap V| = 1$, then the algorithm would not set $L_{d'}$ to $\{v_r\}$, because v_i is a candidate with smaller index. Hence, there is a k-clique K with $|K \cap V| = 1$, which implies that there is a k-clique K with $K \cap V = \{v_r\}$. By the choice of d', for every $v_s \in K \setminus \{v_r\}$, $\mu(v_s)$ is not contained in and thus overlaps $\mu(v_i)$. Hence,

$K' = (K \setminus \{v_r\}) \cup \{v_i\}$ is a k-clique with $K' \cap V = \{v_i\}$, which yields $v_i \in L_{d'}$. This contradiction completes the proof of $(*)$.

Now, suppose that $G[L_d]$ is not clean. This means that there are $v_i, v_j, v_r \in L_d$ such that $\mu(v_i)$ overlaps $\mu(v_j)$ and $\mu(v_r) \subset \mu(v_i) \cap \mu(v_j)$. Consider the set V at the point when the algorithm computes L_d. It follows that there is a k-clique K with $K \cap V = \{v_r\}$. By $(*)$, for every $v_s \in K \setminus \{v_r\}$, $\mu(v_s)$ is not contained in and thus overlaps either of $\mu(v_i)$ and $\mu(v_j)$. Hence, $(K \setminus \{v_r\}) \cup \{v_i, v_j\}$ is a $(k+1)$-clique in G, which contradicts the assumption that $\omega(G) \leqslant k$. □

Proof of Theorem 5.1. Let μ be an overlap model of G, and let $k = \omega(G)$. The proof goes by induction on k. The theorem is trivial for $k = 1$, so assume that $k \geqslant 2$ and the theorem holds for graphs with $\omega \leqslant k-1$. Order the vertices of G as $v_1, \dots, v_n$ so that $\mu(v_i) \not\subset \mu(v_j)$ for $i < j$, and run the k-clique breadth-first search to obtain a partition of $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ into sets L_d. By Lemma 5.3, every L_d induces a clean subgraph of G, so $\chi(G[L_d]) \leqslant \alpha_k$. Color each $G[L_d]$ properly with the same set of α_k colors, obtaining a partition of the vertices of G into color classes $C_1, \dots, C_{\alpha_k}$. Each set of the form $C_i \cap L_d$ is an independent set in G. Let L_{odd} be the union of all sets L_d with d odd and L_{even} be the union of all sets L_d with d even. If there is a k-clique in $G[C_i \cap L_{\text{odd}}]$, then, by Lemma 5.2, it must contain an edge connecting vertices in one set L_d or two consecutive sets L_d and L_{d+1}. The former is impossible, as $C_i \cap L_d$ is independent, while the latter contradicts the definition of L_{odd}. Hence $\omega(G[C_i \cap L_{\text{odd}}]) \leqslant k-1$. Similarly, $\omega(G[C_i \cap L_{\text{even}}]) \leqslant k-1$. It follows from the induction hypothesis that $\chi(G[C_i \cap L_{\text{odd}}]) \leqslant 2^{k-2}\alpha_2 \cdots \alpha_{k-1}$ and $\chi(G[C_i \cap L_{\text{even}}]) \leqslant 2^{k-2}\alpha_2 \cdots \alpha_{k-1}$. This implies $\chi(G) \leqslant 2^{k-1}\alpha_2 \cdots \alpha_k$, as the sets $C_i \cap L_{\text{odd}}$ and $C_i \cap L_{\text{even}}$ for $1 \leqslant i \leqslant \alpha_k$ partition the entire set of vertices of G. □

The inductive nature of Theorem 5.1 is the main obstacle to generalizing the upper bounds of Theorem 1.2 (2) and Theorem 1.3 (2) from clean to non-clean graphs (keeping the same asymptotic bounds). Furthermore, if we replace χ by χ_3 in the proof of Theorem 5.1, then it does no longer work. This is why we are unable to provide the analogue of Theorem 1.4 for non-clean rectangle-overlap graphs. We wonder whether a reduction similar to Theorem 5.1 but avoiding induction is possible.

6. Rectangle and subtree overlap graphs

In this section, we define two on-line games and relate their game graphs to rectangle and subtree overlap graphs. These relations will be used for the proofs of Theorems 1.2–1.4 in Sections 7 and 8. In view of Theorem 5.1, we can restrict our consideration to clean rectangle and subtree overlap graphs.

First, we introduce the on-line game corresponding to clean rectangle overlap graphs, we define interval overlap game graphs, and we describe their relation to clean rectangle overlap graphs that has been established in [23, 27]. Recall that $\mathcal{I}$ denotes the set of closed intervals in $\mathbb{R}$. Let $\ell(x)$ and $r(x)$ denote the left and the right endpoint of an interval $x \in \mathcal{I}$, respectively. Consider an on-line game $\mathsf{IOV}(k)$, in which Presenter builds an interval overlap graph G and a representation $\mu\colon V(G) \to \mathcal{I}$ so that

(i) μ is an overlap model of G ($xy \in E(G)$ if and only if $\mu(x)$ and $\mu(y)$ overlap),
(ii) if $x, y \in V(G)$ and x is presented before y, then $\ell(\mu(x)) < \ell(\mu(y))$,
(iii) μ is clean, that is, there are no $x, y, z \in V(G)$ such that $\mu(x)$ and $\mu(y)$ overlap and $\mu(z) \subset \mu(x) \cap \mu(y)$,

(iv) $\omega(G) \leqslant k$,

and Algorithm properly colors G on-line. We will assume without loss of generality that in any representation μ presented in the game, the intervals are in general position, that is, no two of their endpoints coincide. As a consequence of the definition of a game graph, a graph G is a game graph of $\mathsf{IOV}(k)$ if there exist a rooted forest F on $V(G)$ and a mapping $\mu\colon V(G) \to \mathcal{I}$ such that the following conditions, corresponding to the four above, are satisfied:

(i) $xy \in E(G)$ if and only if $x \prec y$ or $y \prec x$ and $\mu(x)$ overlaps $\mu(y)$,
(ii) if $x, y \in V(G)$ and $x \prec y$, then $\ell(\mu(x)) < \ell(\mu(y))$,
(iii) there are no $x, y, z \in V(G)$ with $x \prec y \prec z$ such that $\mu(x)$ and $\mu(y)$ overlap and $\mu(z) \subset \mu(x) \cap \mu(y)$,
(iv) $\omega(G) \leqslant k$,

where $\prec$ is the ancestor-descendant order of F. A graph is an *interval overlap game graph* if it is a game graph of $\mathsf{IOV}(k)$ for some k. The characterization above (without the condition (iv)) was used in [23] as the definition of an interval overlap game graph.

Lemma 6.1 (Krawczyk, Pawlik, Walczak [23])**.** *Every interval overlap game graph is a clean rectangle overlap graph. The vertices of every clean rectangle overlap graph can be partitioned into $O_\omega(1)$ classes so that the subgraph induced on each class is an interval overlap game graph.*

As it is explained in [23], the correspondence analogous to Lemma 6.1 holds between rectangle overlap graphs and the graphs defined like interval overlap game graphs except that the condition (iii) above is dropped.

It is proved in [23] that triangle-free interval overlap game graphs (and hence, by Lemma 6.1, triangle-free clean rectangle overlap graphs) satisfy $\chi = O(\log \log n)$. That proof essentially comes down to an on-line algorithm using $O(\log r)$ colors in r rounds of the game $\mathsf{IOV}(2)$, a trick with heavy-light decomposition that we explain later, and the application of Lemma 2.1. We will generalize this to game graphs of $\mathsf{IOV}(k)$ and thus to clean rectangle overlap graphs with clique number bounded by any constant. On the other hand, it is proved in [27] that Presenter has a strategy to force Algorithm to use c colors in 2^{c-1} rounds of the game $\mathsf{IOV}(2)$. This strategy (again a realization of the strategy for forests mentioned in the introduction) has $2^{2^{O(c)}}$ presentation scenarios. Hence, by Lemma 2.2, there are triangle-free interval overlap game graphs (and thus triangle-free clean rectangle overlap graphs) with chromatic number $\Theta(\log \log n)$.

We also define an on-line game $\mathsf{IOV}_3(k)$, a variant of $\mathsf{IOV}(k)$ in which Algorithm is required to produce a triangle-free coloring instead of a proper coloring. The rules for Presenter's moves are the same in $\mathsf{IOV}(k)$ and $\mathsf{IOV}_3(k)$, and therefore the classes of game graphs of $\mathsf{IOV}(k)$ and $\mathsf{IOV}_3(k)$ are also the same.

Now, we introduce the on-line game corresponding to clean subtree overlap graphs. Let G be a clean subtree overlap graph with a clean overlap model $x \mapsto S_x$ by subtrees of a tree T. To avoid confusion with vertices of G, we call vertices of T *nodes*. We make T a rooted tree by choosing an arbitrary node r as the root. For every $x \in V(G)$, we define r_x to be the unique node of S_x that is closest to r in T. We call the nodes r_x *subtree roots*. Adding some new nodes to T and to some of the subtrees S_x if necessary, we can assume without loss of generality that all subtree roots are pairwise distinct. We construct a rooted forest F on $V(G)$ as follows. A vertex $x \in V(G)$ is a root of F if the path from r to r_x in T contains no subtree roots other than r_x. Otherwise, the



FIGURE 5. A subtree overlap graph and interval filament representations of its subgraphs induced on the subtrees intersecting the paths $abcdef$ (top) and $abcdgh$ (bottom). The domains of the interval filaments represeting the subtrees $cdeg$ (green) and def (orange) overlap in the scenario $abcdef$ but are nested in the scenario $abcdgh$.

parent of x in F is the vertex $y \in V(G)$ such that r_y is the last subtree root before r_x on the path from r to r_x in T.

Consider a path P in F from a root to a leaf. The overlap graph of the subtrees S_x with $x \in V(P)$ is an interval filament graph [8]. Its interval filament intersection model can be constructed as follows. The roots of all the subtrees S_x with $x \in V(P)$ lie on a common path $Q = q_1 \cdots q_m$ in T. For $1 \leqslant i \leqslant m$, let T_i denote the connected component of T containing q_i after removing all edges of Q. We represent the nodes of T by points in $\mathbb{R}^2$, as follows. Each node q_i is represented by the point $(i, 1)$. Each node t in T_i other than q_i is represented by a point $(x_t, 1)$, where $x_t \in (i, i+1)$ and all the x_t are distinct. Now, we can represent each vertex $x \in V(P)$ such that the intersection of S_x and Q is the subpath $q_i \cdots q_j$ of Q by an interval filament that starts in the interval $(i-1, i)$, ends in the interval $(j, j+1)$, and goes above the points representing the nodes in S_x and no other points representing nodes. Moreover, we can do this so that the interval filaments representing non-adjacent vertices (with nested or disjoint subtrees) do not intersect. This yields an interval filament intersection model of $G[V(P)]$.

In view of the above, a natural attempt is to define the on-line game corresponding to subtree overlap graphs just like the game $\mathsf{IOV}(k)$ but with representation by interval filaments instead of intervals. However, this is not correct for the following reason. We want to color the clean subtree overlap graph G properly using the on-line approach of Lemma 2.1. For each path P in F starting at a root, we will simulate an on-line algorithm on $G[V(P)]$ presenting the vertices in their order along P. This way, we will present an interval filament graph. The on-line approach will work correctly if the algorithm always assigns the same color to each vertex $x \in V(G)$, regardless of the choice of P. This will be the case when the presentation scenarios up to the point when u is presented are identical for all paths passing through x. However, this cannot be guaranteed using the model of $G[V(P)]$ by interval filaments described above. For example, for some two adjacent vertices $x, y \in V(G)$ lying on the common part of two paths P_1 and P_2, we may need to represent x and y by interval filaments whose domains are nested if we continue along P_1, but overlap if we continue along P_2. See Figure 5 for such an example. If the algorithm makes use of the representation, then the colorings it generates on P_1 and P_2 may be inconsistent. We will show at the end



FIGURE 6. Interval filament representations of $a \Supset b$, $a \between b$, and $a \parallel b$. The two drawings of $a \between b$ distinguish whether the domains of the interval filaments representing a and b are nested or overlap. Other drawings of $a \between b$ can be obtained by letting a and b cross many times.

of Section 7 that the knowledge of the representation indeed allows the algorithm to use asymptotically fewer colors.

We overcome the above-mentioned difficulty providing a more abstract description of G, which we then use to define the on-line game. For distinct vertices $x, y \in V(G)$, let $x \prec y$ denote that x is an ancestor of y in F. We define relations $\Supset$, $\between$ and $\parallel$ on $V(G)$ as follows:

- $x \Supset y$ if $x \prec y$ and the subtree S_x contains the subtree S_y,
- $x \between y$ if $x \prec y$ and the subtrees S_x and S_y overlap,
- $x \parallel y$ if $x \prec y$ and the subtrees S_x and S_y are disjoint.

It follows that the relations $\Supset$, $\between$ and $\parallel$ partition the relation $\prec$, that is, they are pairwise disjoint and their union is the entire $\prec$. Furthermore, the following conditions are satisfied for any $x, y, z \in V(G)$:

(A1) if $x \Supset y$ and $y \Supset z$, then $x \Supset z$,
(A2) if $x \Supset y$ and $y \between z$, then $x \Supset z$ or $x \between z$,
(A3) if $x \between y$ and $y \Supset z$, then $x \between z$ or $x \parallel z$,
(A4) if $x \parallel y$ and $y \prec z$, then $x \parallel z$.

We define an on-line game $\mathsf{ABS}(k)$ in which Presenter builds a graph G together with relations $\Supset$, $\between$ and $\parallel$, in each round defining the relations $\Supset$, $\between$ and $\parallel$ between the new vertex and the vertices presented before, so that

(i) $\Supset$, $\between$ and $\parallel$ partition the order of presentation $\prec$ and satisfy (A1)–(A4),
(ii) $xy \in E(G)$ if and only if $x \between y$ or $y \between x$,
(iii) $\omega(G) \leqslant k$,

and Algorithm properly colors G on-line. No interval filament intersection representation is revealed by Presenter in the game $\mathsf{ABS}(k)$. See Figure 6 for an illustration of possible representations of the relations $\Supset$, $\between$ and $\parallel$ in the game.

Lemma 6.2. *A graph G is a game graph of $\mathsf{ABS}(k)$ if and only if G is a clean subtree overlap graph. If G is a game graph of $\mathsf{ABS}(k)$ and the relation $\prec$ (as defined for a game graph) is a total order on $V(G)$, then G is an interval filament graph.*

Proof. We have argued above that every clean subtree overlap graph with clique number at most k is a game graph of $\mathsf{ABS}(k)$. Now, suppose that G is a game graph of $\mathsf{ABS}(k)$. This implies that there exist a rooted forest F on $V(G)$ and relations $\Supset$, $\between$ and $\parallel$ on $V(G)$ such that

(i) $\Supset$, $\between$ and $\parallel$ partition the ancestor-descendant order $\prec$ of F and satisfy (A1)–(A4),
(ii) $xy \in E(G)$ if and only if $x \between y$ or $y \between x$,

(iii) $\omega(G) \leqslant k$.

Let T be a tree with

$$V(T) = \{r\} \cup \{u_x \colon x \in V(G)\} \cup \{v_x \colon x \in V(G)\},$$
$$E(T) = \{ru_x \colon x \text{ is a root of } F\} \cup \{u_x u_y \colon xy \in E(F)\} \cup \{u_x v_x \colon x \in V(G)\}.$$

For $x \in V(G)$, let $S_x = \{u_x, v_x\} \cup \{u_y \colon x \Subset y \text{ or } x \between y\} \cup \{v_y \colon x \Subset y\}$. We show that $x \mapsto S_x$ is a clean overlap model of G by subtrees of T.

If $x \prec y$ and $u_y \notin S_x$, then $x \parallel y$, so $x \parallel z$ and thus $u_z \notin S_x$ for every z with $y \prec z$, by (A4). Hence, every S_x is the node set of a subtree of T. If $x \Subset y$, then $y \Subset z$ implies $x \Subset z$, by (A1), and $y \between z$ implies $x \Subset z$ or $x \between z$, by (A2), hence $S_y \subset S_x$. If $x \between y$, then $u_x, v_x \in S_x \setminus S_y$ and $v_y \in S_y \setminus S_x$, hence S_x and S_y overlap. Finally, if $x \parallel y$, then, by (A4), $x \parallel z$ for every z with $y \prec z$, so $S_x \cap S_y = \emptyset$. This shows that $x \mapsto S_x$ is indeed an overlap model of G. Moreover, by (A3), there are no x, y, z with $x \between y \Subset z$ and $x \Subset z$, so the model is clean. This completes the proof of the first statement.

For the proof of the second statement, assume that the underlying forest F of the game graph G consists of just one root-to-leaf path. It follows directly from the construction that all sets S_x for $x \in V(G)$ intersect the set $\{u_x \colon x \in V(G)\}$, which forms a path in T. As it has been explained earlier in this section, an overlap graph of subtrees of T all of which intersect some path in T is an interval filament graph. □

The game $\mathsf{IOV}(k)$ is more restrictive for Presenter than $\mathsf{ABS}(k)$, in the sense that every presentation scenario in the former can be translated into a presentation scenario in the latter. Indeed, let G be a graph presented in $\mathsf{IOV}(k)$ together with representation $\mu \colon V(G) \to \mathcal{I}$ and order of presentation $\prec$. We can define relations $\Subset$, $\between$ and $\parallel$ on $V(G)$ just as before:

- $x \Subset y$ if $x \prec y$ and the interval $\mu(x)$ contains the interval $\mu(y)$,
- $x \between y$ if $x \prec y$ and the intervals $\mu(x)$ and $\mu(y)$ overlap,
- $x \parallel y$ if $x \prec y$ and the intervals $\mu(x)$ and $\mu(y)$ are disjoint.

Clearly, the conditions (i)–(iii) of $\mathsf{ABS}(k)$ are satisfied. This and Lemma 6.2 imply that every interval overlap game graph is a clean subtree overlap graph.

7. Coloring algorithm for rectangle and subtree overlap graphs

In this section, we will prove that game graphs of $\mathsf{ABS}(k)$ have chromatic number $O_k((\log\log n)^{k-1})$, while game graphs of $\mathsf{IOV}(k)$ (which are the same as game graphs of $\mathsf{IOV}_3(k)$) have chromatic number $O_k(\log\log n)$ and triangle-free chromatic number $O_k(1)$. Then, the same bounds on the chromatic number of clean subtree overlap graphs and (respectively) the chromatic number and triangle-free chromatic number of rectangle overlap graphs follow from Lemmas 6.2 and 6.1 (respectively).

The general idea is to provide on-line algorithms in $\mathsf{ABS}(k)$, $\mathsf{IOV}(k)$ and $\mathsf{IOV}_3(k)$ using few colors, and then to use Lemma 2.1 to derive upper bounds on the (triangle-free) chromatic number of their game graphs. However, since Presenter has a strategy to force Algorithm to use $\Omega(\log r)$ colors in r rounds of the game $\mathsf{IOV}(2)$, direct application of Lemma 2.1 to the game graph cannot succeed for $\mathsf{ABS}(k)$ and $\mathsf{IOV}(k)$ if the rooted forest F underlying the game graph contains long paths. To solve this problem, we use the technique of *heavy-light decomposition* due to Sleator and Tarjan [31].

Let G be a game graph of $\mathsf{ABS}(k)$ or $\mathsf{IOV}(k)$ with n vertices and with an underlying forest F. Thus $\omega(G) \leqslant k$. We call an edge xy of F, where y is a child of x, *heavy* if

the subtree of F rooted at y contains more than half of the vertices of the subtree of F rooted at x, and we call it *light* otherwise. Every vertex of F has a heavy edge to at most one of its children, so the heavy edges form a collection of paths in F, called *heavy paths*. The following is proved by an easy induction.

Lemma 7.1 (Sleator, Tarjan [31])**.** *Every path in F from a root to a leaf contains at most $\lfloor \log_2 n \rfloor$ light edges.*

Let $b = \lfloor \log_2 n \rfloor + 1$. For each heavy path P, by the second statement of Lemma 6.2, the graph $G[V(P)]$ is an interval filament graph, so, by Theorem 1.1 (1), it can be colored properly using $O_k(1)$ colors. In the special case that G is a game graph of $\mathsf{IOV}(k)$, by the result of Kostochka and Milans [22], even $2k-1$ colors suffice. We use the same set of colors on each heavy path, so that we use $O_k(1)$ colors in total. We will color the subgraph of G induced on each color class separately by an on-line algorithm, using $O_k((\log b)^{k-1})$ colors in $\mathsf{ABS}(k)$ and $O_k(\log b)$ colors in $\mathsf{IOV}(k)$.

Formally, we define on-line games $\mathsf{ABS}(k,b)$ and $\mathsf{IOV}(k,b)$ like $\mathsf{ABS}(k)$ and $\mathsf{IOV}(k)$, respectively, but with one additional constraint:

(v) there is a partition of $V(G)$ into at most b blocks of vertices consecutive in the order $\prec$ such that no edge of G connects vertices in the same block.

It follows from Lemma 7.1 and the definition of b that the game graph of $\mathsf{ABS}(k)$ or $\mathsf{IOV}(k)$ induced on each color class as explained above is a game graph of $\mathsf{ABS}(k,b)$ or $\mathsf{IOV}(k,b)$, respectively. We will prove the following.

Lemma 7.2. *There is an on-line $O_k((\log b)^{k-1})$-coloring algorithm in $\mathsf{ABS}(k,b)$.*

Lemma 7.3. *There is an on-line $O_k(\log b)$-coloring algorithm in $\mathsf{IOV}(k,b)$.*

Lemma 7.4. *There is an on-line $O_k(1)$-coloring algorithm in $\mathsf{IOV}_3(k)$.*

For the next part of this section, we are in the setting of Lemma 7.2: a graph G with relations $\trianglerighteq$, $\between$ and $\parallel$ is presented in the game $\mathsf{ABS}(k,b)$. We are to color G properly using $O_k((\log b)^{k-1})$ colors on-line. Whatever we show for $\mathsf{ABS}(k,b)$ applies also to $\mathsf{IOV}(k,b)$, as the latter is more restrictive for Presenter. The proof of Lemma 7.3 will differ only in one part, where the use of a direct argument instead of induction will allow us to reduce the number of colors to $O_k(\log b)$. The last part of that proof, which raises the number of colors from $O_k(1)$ to $O_k(\log b)$, can be omitted when we aim only at a triangle-free coloring, whence Lemma 7.4 will follow.

As the vertices of G are being presented, we classify them as *primary* or *secondary* according to the following on-line rule: if there are $x, y \in V(G)$ such that y is primary, $x \between y$, $x \between z$, and $y \trianglerighteq z$, then z is secondary; otherwise z is primary. Let P denote the set of primary vertices, built on-line during the game. For every $y \in P$, let $S(y)$ be the set containing y and all secondary vertices z such that $y \trianglerighteq z$ and there is x with $x \between y$ and $x \between z$, also built on-line during the game. See Figure 7 for an illustration. The following lemma will be used implicitly throughout the rest of this section.

Lemma 7.5. *For every $z \in V(G)$, there is a unique $p \in P$ such that $z \in S(p)$.*

Proof. Suppose to the contrary that there are $p, q \in P$ such that $p \prec q$ and $z \in S(p) \cap S(q)$. It follows that z is secondary, $p \trianglerighteq z$, and $q \trianglerighteq z$. We cannot have $p \between q$, as this would contradict (A3), nor $p \parallel q$, as this would contradict (A4). Hence $p \trianglerighteq q$. Since $z \in S(p)$, there is $x \in V(G)$ such that $x \between p$ and $x \between z$. Since $x \between p \trianglerighteq q$, we



FIGURE 7. A presentation scenario of an interval filament graph in the game $\mathsf{ABS}(3)$ and one of its possible representations. The representation is for illustration only and is not revealed by Presenter in the game. The primary vertices are a, b, c, e, h. We have $S(a) = \{a\}$, $S(b) = \{b\}$, $S(c) = \{c, d, g\}$, $S(e) = \{e, f\}$, and $S(h) = \{h, i, j\}$.

have $x \between q$ or $x \parallel q$, by (A3). However, we cannot have $x \parallel q$, as this and $q \Subset z$ would contradict (A4). Hence $x \between q$. This contradicts the assumption that q is primary. □

The next lemma will allow us to construct an on-line coloring of G from on-line colorings of $G[P]$ and each $G[S(p)]$ with $p \in P$.

Lemma 7.6. *The vertices in P can be 2-colored on-line so that if $p, q \in P$ have the same color and $pq \notin E(G[P])$, then $xy \notin E(G)$ for any $x \in S(p)$ and $y \in S(q)$.*

Proof. We make the following two observations:

(i) If $p, q \in P$, $p \prec q$, $pq \notin E(G)$, $x \in S(p)$, $y \in S(q)$, and $xy \in E(G)$, then $x \between q$.
(ii) For every $q \in P$, there is at most one $p \in P$ with the following properties: $p \prec q$, $pq \notin E(G)$, and there is $x \in S(p)$ with $x \between q$.

Once they are established, we can argue as follows. By (ii), P can be colored on-line using two colors so as to distinguish any $p, q \in P$ such that $p \prec q$, $pq \notin E(G)$, and there is $x \in S(p)$ with $x \between q$. It follows from (i) that if $p, q \in P$, $p \prec q$, $pq \notin E(G)$, $x \in S(P)$, $y \in S(q)$, and $xy \in E(G)$, then $x \between q$ and therefore $\phi(p) \neq \phi(q)$.

It remains to prove (i) and (ii). First, we show the following property:

(iii) If $p, q \in P$, $p \prec q$, $pq \notin E(G)$, $x \in S(p)$, $q \Subset y$, and $xy \in E(G)$, then $p \Subset q$ and $x \between q$.

Suppose $p \parallel q$. We cannot have $q \prec x$, as this would imply $p \parallel x$, by (A4). Hence $x \prec q$. It follows from (A4) that $p \parallel y$. But $p \Subset x$ and $x \between y$ imply $p \Subset y$ or $p \between y$, by (A2), which contradicts $p \parallel y$. Therefore, we cannot have $p \parallel q$. We cannot have $p \between q$ either, as $pq \notin E(G)$. So we have $p \Subset q$. Since $x \in S(p)$, there is some u with $u \between p$ and $u \between x$. We cannot have $u \Subset q$, because this would contradict (A3). We cannot have $u \between q$, because then q would be secondary. Hence $u \parallel q$. This implies $x \prec q$, whence we have $p \Subset x \prec q \Subset y$ and $x \between y$. We cannot have $x \Subset q$, because this would imply $x \Subset y$. We cannot have $x \parallel q$ either, by (A4). Hence $x \between q$.

Now, (i) follows immediately from (iii). To see (ii), suppose there are $p_1, p_2, q \in P$ such that $p_1 \prec p_2 \prec q$, $p_1q \notin E(G)$, $p_2q \notin E(G)$, and there are $x_1 \in S(p_1)$ and $x_2 \in S(p_2)$ with $x_1 \between q$ and $x_2 \between q$. By (iii), we have $p_1 \Subset q$ and $p_2 \Subset q$. We cannot have $p_1 \between p_2$, as this would contradict (A3) for p_1, p_2 and q. Hence $p_1p_2 \notin E(G)$. We apply (iii) to p_1, p_2, x_1 and q to conclude that $x_1 \between p_2$. Now, since $x_1 \between p_2 \Subset q$ and $x_1 \between q$, we conclude that q is secondary, which is a contradiction. □

The following lemma will allow us to color $G[S(p)]$ for every $p \in P$.

Lemma 7.7. *For every $p \in P$, there is $x \in V(G)$ such that $x \between y$ for every $y \in S(p)$.*

Proof. Let $p \in P$. Let z be the latest presented vertex in $S(p)$. It follows that there is $x \in V(G)$ such that $x \between p$ and $x \between z$. Now, take any $y \in S(p) \setminus \{z\}$. We have $x \between p$ and $p \Subset y$, so $x \between y$ or $x \parallel y$, by (A3). We cannot have $x \parallel y$, as this would imply $x \parallel z$, by (A4). Hence $x \between y$. □

It follows from Lemma 7.7 that $\omega(G[S(p)]) \leqslant k-1$ for every $p \in P$. This will allow us to use induction to color every $G[S(p)]$ in the abstract overlap game. For the interval overlap game, instead of induction, we will use the following direct argument.

Lemma 7.8. *If G is an interval overlap graph presented on-line in the game $\mathsf{IOV}(k,b)$ or $\mathsf{IOV}_3(k)$, then for every $p \in P$, the graph $G[S(p)]$ can be properly colored on-line using at most $\binom{k}{2}$ colors.*

Proof. Let μ denote the interval overlap representation of G presented in the game together with G. Consider one of the sets $S(p)$ being built during the game. By Lemma 7.7, there is $x \in V(G)$ such that $\ell(\mu(x)) < \ell(\mu(y)) < r(\mu(x)) < r(\mu(y))$ for every $y \in S(p)$. Define a partial order $<$ on $S(p)$ so that $y < z$ whenever $\ell(\mu(y)) < \ell(\mu(z))$ and $r(\mu(y)) > r(\mu(z))$. It follows that $G[S(p)]$ is the incomparability graph of $S(p)$ with respect to $<$. Moreover, the set $S(p)$ is built in the up-growing manner with respect to $<$, that is, every vertex is maximal with respect to $<$ at the moment it is presented. Since $\omega(G[S(p)]) \leqslant k-1$, it follows from Theorem 4.3 that the graph $G[S(p)]$ can be properly colored on-line using $\binom{k}{2}$ colors. □

We will color the graph $G[P]$ in two steps, only the first of which is needed for the proof of Lemma 7.4.

Lemma 7.9. *The graph $G[P]$ can be colored on-line using k colors so that the following holds for any $x, y, z \in P$ of the same color:*

$$(*) \qquad \text{if } x \between y \prec z, \text{ then } x \parallel z \text{ or } y \parallel z;$$

in particular, the coloring of $G[P]$ is triangle-free.

Proof. We use the following two observations:

(i) If x, y, z do not satisfy $(*)$, then neither do x, y, y' for any y' with $y \prec y' \prec z$.
(ii) If x, y, z are in P and do not satisfy $(*)$, then $y \between z$.

To see (i), suppose $x \between y \prec y' \prec z$ and $x \parallel y'$ or $y \parallel y'$. By (A4), this yields $x \parallel z$ or $y \parallel z$, respectively, so x, y, z satisfy $(*)$. To see (ii), suppose $x \between y \Subset z$. By (A3), this yields $x \between z$ or $x \parallel z$. We cannot have $x \between z$, as then z would be secondary. Hence $x \parallel z$, which implies that x, y, z satisfy $(*)$.

The coloring of $G[P]$ is constructed as follows. At the time when a vertex $z \in P$ is presented, consider the set Y of all vertices $y \in P$ for which there is $x \in P$ such that x, y, z do not satisfy $(*)$. By (i), for any $y, y' \in Y \cup \{z\}$ with $y \prec y'$, there is $x \in P$ such that x, y, y' do not satisfy $(*)$. This and (ii) imply that $Y \cup \{z\}$ is a clique in $G[P]$, hence $|Y| \leqslant k-1$. Therefore, at least one of the k colors is not used on any vertex from Y, and we use such a color for z. It is clear that the coloring of $G[P]$ thus obtained satisfies the condition of the lemma. □

First-fit is the on-line algorithm that colors the graph properly with positive integers in a greedy way: when a new vertex v is presented, it is assigned the least color that has not been used on any of the neighbors of v presented before v.

Theorem 7.10 (folklore)**.** *First-fit uses at most* $\lfloor \log_2 n \rfloor + 1$ *colors on any forest with* n *vertices presented in any order.*

Let P' be a subset of P being built on-line during the game so that any $x, y, z \in P'$ satisfy the condition $(*)$ of Lemma 7.9. For the proofs of Lemmas 7.2 and 7.3, we apply First-fit to obtain a proper coloring of $G[P']$.

Lemma 7.11. *First-fit colors the graph* $G[P']$ *properly on-line using* $O(\log b)$ *colors.*

Proof. Let R denote the set of vertices in P' that have no neighbor to the right in $G[P']$. We show that each member of $P' \setminus R$ has at most one neighbor to the right in $G[P' \setminus R]$. Suppose to the contrary that there are $x, y, z \in P' \setminus R$ with $x \between y \prec z$ and $x \between z$. Since $y \in P' \setminus R$, there is $z' \in P'$ such that $y \between z'$. Since $x \between z$, we have $y \parallel z$, and since $y \between z'$, we have $x \parallel z'$, because x, y, z satisfy the condition $(*)$ of Lemma 7.9. However, we have $z \prec z'$ or $z' \prec z$, which implies either $y \parallel z'$ or $x \parallel z$, by (A4). This contradiction shows that each member of $P' \setminus R$ has at most one neighbor to the right in $G[P' \setminus R]$. In particular, $G[P' \setminus R]$ is a forest.

Clearly, the colors assigned by First-fit to the vertices in $P' \setminus R$ do not depend on the colors assigned to the vertices in R. In particular, if we ran First-fit only on the graph $G[P' \setminus R]$, then we would obtain exactly the same colors on the vertices in $P' \setminus R$. Let a be the maximum color used by First-fit on $G[P']$. Since there is a vertex in P' with color a, there must be a vertex in $P' \setminus R$ with color $a - 1$. This, the fact that $G[P' \setminus R]$ is a forest, and Theorem 7.10 yield $a \leqslant \lfloor \log_2 |P'| \rfloor + 2$.

We apply a similar reasoning to show $a \leqslant \lfloor \log_2 b \rfloor + 3$. Recall the assumption that there is a partition of $V(G)$ into at most b blocks of $\prec$-consecutive vertices such that no edge of $G[P']$ connects vertices in the same block. Let Q be the set obtained from $P' \setminus R$ by removing all vertices with color 1. If we ran First-fit only on $G[Q]$, then each vertex in Q would get the color less by 1 than the color it has received in the first-fit coloring of $G[P' \setminus R]$. Therefore, our hypothetic run of First-fit on $G[Q]$ uses at least $a - 2$ colors, which implies, by Theorem 7.10, that $a \leqslant \lfloor \log_2 |Q| \rfloor + 3$. Now, it is enough to prove that each block B of $\prec$-consecutive vertices of G such that $G[B]$ has no edge can contain at most one vertex of Q, as this will imply $|Q| \leqslant b$. Suppose to the contrary that there are two vertices $y_1, y_2 \in Q \cap B$ with $y_1 \prec y_2$. By the assumption that $G[B]$ has no edge, we do not have $y_1 \between y_2$. Each member of Q has a neighbor to the left and a neighbor to the right in $G[P']$, neither of which can belong to B. Therefore, there are $x, z \in P'$ such that $x \prec y_1 \prec y_2 \prec z$, $x \between y_2$, and $y_1 \between z$. We cannot have $y_1 \parallel y_2$, as this and $y_2 \prec z$ would imply $y_1 \parallel z$, by (A4). Hence $y_1 \Subset y_2$. We cannot have $x \parallel y_1$, as this and $y_1 \prec y_2$ would imply $x \parallel y_2$, by (A4). Neither can we have $x \Subset y_1$, as this and $y_1 \Subset y_2$ would imply $x \Subset y_2$, by (A1). Hence $x \between y_1$. This, $y_1 \Subset y_2$ and $x \between y_2$ contradict the assumption that y_2 is primary. We have thus shown $a = O(\log b)$, which completes the proof. □

Proof of Lemma 7.2. The proof goes by induction on k. The case $k = 1$ is trivial, so assume $k \geqslant 2$. By Lemma 7.9, $G[P]$ can be colored on-line using colors $1, \ldots, k$ so as to guarantee the condition $(*)$ for any $x, y, z \in P$. For $p \in P$, let $\phi(p)$ denote the color of p in such a coloring. For $i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$, let $P_i = \{p \in P \colon \phi(p) = i\}$. By Lemma 7.11, each $G[P_i]$ can be properly colored on-line using colors $1, \ldots, \ell$, where $\ell = O(\log b)$. For $p \in P_i$, let $\psi(p)$ denote the color of p in such a coloring. For $i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$ and $j \in \{1, \ldots, \ell\}$, let $P_{i,j} = \{p \in P_i \colon \psi(p) = j\}$. By Lemma 7.6, each set $P_{i,j}$ can be further 2-colored on-line so as to distinguish any $p, q \in P_{i,j}$ for which there is some

edge between $S(p)$ and $S(q)$. Let ζ be such a 2-coloring of each $P_{i,j}$ using colors 1 and 2. For each $p \in P$, it follows from Lemma 7.7 that $\omega(G[S(p)]) \leqslant k-1$ and therefore, by the induction hypothesis, $G[S(p)]$ can be properly colored on-line using colors $1, \ldots, m$, where $m = O_k((\log b)^{k-2})$. For $p \in P$ and $x \in S(p)$, let $\xi(x)$ denote the color of x in such a coloring. We color each vertex $x \in S(p)$ by the quadruple $(\phi(p), \psi(p), \zeta(p), \xi(x))$. This is a proper coloring of G using at most $2k\ell m = O_k((\log b)^{k-1})$ colors. □

Proof of Lemma 7.3. The proof goes as above with one change: for every $p \in P$, we apply Lemma 7.8 instead of induction to color $G[S(p)]$ properly using colors $1, \ldots, \binom{k}{2}$. This gives a proper coloring of G using at most $2k\ell\binom{k}{2} = O_k(\log b)$ colors. □

Proof of Lemma 7.4. By Lemma 7.9, $G[P]$ can be triangle-free colored on-line using colors $1, \ldots, k$. For $p \in P$, let $\phi(p)$ denote the color of p in such a coloring. For $i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$, let $P_i = \{p \in P \colon \phi(p) = i\}$. By Lemma 7.6, each set P_i can be further 2-colored on-line so as to distinguish any $p, q \in P_i$ such that $pq \notin E(G)$ and there is some edge between $S(p)$ and $S(q)$. Let ζ be such a 2-coloring of each P_i using colors 1 and 2. For each $p \in P$, by Lemma 7.8, $G[S(p)]$ can be properly colored on-line using colors $1, \ldots, \binom{k}{2}$. For $p \in P$ and $x \in S(p)$, let $\xi(x)$ denote the color of x in such a coloring. We color each vertex $x \in S(p)$ by the triple $(\phi(p), \zeta(p), \xi(x))$. It follows that if $p, q \in P$, $x \in S(p)$, $y \in S(q)$, $(\phi(p), \zeta(p), \xi(x)) = (\phi(q), \zeta(q), \xi(y))$, and $xy \in E(G)$, then $pq \in E(G)$. Therefore, since ϕ is triangle-free, the coloring by triples is a triangle-free coloring of G using at most $2k\binom{k}{2}$ colors. □

Theorems 1.2 (1)–(2) and 1.3 now follow from Theorem 5.1, Lemmas 6.2 and 6.1 (respectively), Lemmas 7.2 and 7.3 (respectively), Lemma 2.1, and the fact that $b = \lfloor \log_2 n \rfloor + 1$. Theorem 1.4 follows from Lemmas 6.1, 7.4 and 2.1.

In the next section, we will prove that the proper coloring algorithm of clean subtree overlap graphs presented above uses the asymptotically optimal number of colors.

To conclude the discussion of the upper bounds, consider an on-line game on interval filament graphs which is like $\mathsf{ABS}(k, b)$ except that the vertices are presented with their representation by interval filaments. The order in which the vertices are presented agrees with the increasing order of the left endpoints of the domains of these interval filaments. Call this game $\mathsf{IFIL}(k, b)$. We show that there is an on-line $O_k(\log b)$-coloring algorithm in $\mathsf{IFIL}(k, b)$. This and the result of the next section (Lemma 8.1) explains why the abstract definition of the games $\mathsf{ABS}(k)$ and $\mathsf{ABS}(k, b)$ is so important.

Let $u \mapsto f_u$ denote the interval filament representation being revealed by Presenter in the game $\mathsf{IFIL}(k, b)$. The on-line algorithm for $\mathsf{IFIL}(k, b)$ constructs an auxiliary coloring, which is a proper coloring of the overlap graph of the domains of the interval filaments f_u. By Lemma 7.3, this can be done with the use of $O_k(\log b)$ colors. The interval filaments f_u for the vertices u within each color class have non-overlapping domains. Therefore, by Lemma 4.2, the subgraph induced on each color class is a game graph of the game $\mathsf{COCO}(k)$. Fix a color class C, and let $\prec'$ denote the partial order on the vertices in C such that $u \prec' v$ if and only if $\mathrm{dom}(f_u) \supset \mathrm{dom}(f_v)$. This is exactly the ancestor-descendant order of the graph induced on C interpreted as the game graph of $\mathsf{COCO}(k)$ according to Lemma 4.2. Using Theorem 4.3, we can properly color the graph induced on C with the use of at most $\binom{k+1}{2}$ colors exactly as it is done in the proof of Lemma 2.1. Even though in our current setting the graph is presented on-line in the game $\mathsf{IFIL}(k, b)$, the coloring argument of the proof of Lemma 2.1 still works, because $u \prec' v$ implies that u is presented before v.

8. Subtree overlap graphs with large chromatic number

In this final section, we will present a construction of clean subtree overlap graphs with chromatic number $\Theta_\omega((\log\log n)^{\omega-1})$ and thus prove Theorem 1.2 (3). To this end, we will prove the following.

Lemma 8.1. *For $k, m \geqslant 1$, Presenter has a finite strategy to force Algorithm to use at least $2m^{k-1}-1$ colors in $2^{O_k(m)}$ rounds of the game $\mathsf{ABS}(k)$. Moreover, the number of presentation scenarios for all possible responses of Algorithm is $2^{2^{O_k(m)}}$.*

The strategy that we will construct is a generalization of the strategy of Presenter forcing the use of c colors in 2^{c-1} rounds of the game $\mathsf{IOV}(2)$ described in [23, 27].

For convenience, we extend the notation $\supseteq$, $\between$ and $\parallel$ to sets of vertices in a natural way. For example, $X \supseteq Y$ denotes that $x \supseteq y$ for all $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$.

The strategy that we are going to describe presents a set of vertices with relations $\supseteq$, $\between$ and $\parallel$ that partition the order of presentation $\prec$ and satisfy the conditions (A1)–(A4). The graph G is defined on these vertices by the relation $\between$, that is, so that $xy \in E(G)$ if and only if $x \between y$ or $y \between x$. The strategy ensures $\omega(G) \leqslant k$, so all conditions of the definition of $\mathsf{ABS}(k)$ are satisfied.

The strategy is expressed in terms of a recursive procedure `present`$(k,\ \ell,\ m,\ A_1,\ A_2)$, initially called as `present`$(k,\ 2m,\ m,\ \emptyset,\ \emptyset)$. Every recursive call to `present`$(k,\ \ell,\ m,\ A_1,\ A_2)$ assumes that

- some vertices with relations $\supseteq$, $\between$ and $\parallel$ between them have been already presented,
- A_1 and A_2 are disjoint sets of already presented vertices such that $A_1 \supseteq A_2$,
- $2 \leqslant \ell \leqslant 2m$,

and it produces the following results:

- it presents a new set of vertices S,
- it defines relations $\supseteq$, $\between$ and $\parallel$ between the vertices in S and between the vertices presented before and the vertices in S,
- it returns a set $R \subset S$ to be used by the parent recursive call of `present`.

The returned set R is chosen so that at least $\ell m^{k-2}-1$ colors have been used on the vertices in R. See Figure 8 for an illustration.

Procedure `present`$(k,\ \ell,\ m,\ A_1,\ A_2)$
if $k = 1$ **then**
  present a new vertex y with relations $A_1 \supseteq y$, $A_2 \between y$, and $x \parallel y$ for any $x \notin A_1 \cup A_2$ that has been presented before;
  return $\{y\}$;
else if $\ell = 2$ **then**
  return `present`$(k-1,\ 2m,\ m,\ A_1,\ A_2)$;
else
  $R_1 :=$ `present`$(k,\ \ell-1,\ m,\ A_1,\ A_2)$;
  $R_2 :=$ `present`$(k,\ \ell-1,\ m,\ A_1 \cup R_1,\ A_2)$;
  if Algorithm has used at least $\ell m^{k-2}-1$ colors on $R_1 \cup R_2$ **then**
    return $R_1 \cup R_2$;
  else
    $R_3 :=$ `present`$(k-1,\ 2m,\ m,\ A_1 \cup R_1,\ A_2 \cup R_2)$;
    return $R_1 \cup R_3$;

- $\texttt{present}(3,2,2,\emptyset,\emptyset) = \texttt{present}(2,4,2,\emptyset,\emptyset)$
  - $\texttt{present}(2,3,2,\emptyset,\emptyset)$
    - $\texttt{present}(2,2,2,\emptyset,\emptyset) = \texttt{present}(1,4,2,\emptyset,\emptyset)$
    - $\texttt{present}(2,2,2,a,\emptyset) = \texttt{present}(1,4,2,a,\emptyset)$
    - $\texttt{number of colors}(ab) \geqslant 2\,? \;\rightarrow\; \text{NO}$
    - $\texttt{present}(1,4,2,a,b)$
  - $\texttt{present}(2,3,2,ac,\emptyset)$
    - $\texttt{present}(2,2,2,ac,\emptyset) = \texttt{present}(1,4,2,ac,\emptyset)$
    - $\texttt{present}(2,2,2,acd,\emptyset) = \texttt{present}(1,4,2,acd,\emptyset)$
    - $\texttt{number of colors}(de) \geqslant 2\,? \;\rightarrow\; \text{YES}$
  - $\texttt{number of colors}(acde) \geqslant 3\,? \;\rightarrow\; \text{NO}$
  - $\texttt{present}(1,4,2,ac,de)$
- $\texttt{present}(3,2,2,acf,\emptyset) = \texttt{present}(2,4,2,acf,\emptyset)$
  - $\texttt{present}(2,3,2,acf,\emptyset)$
    - $\texttt{present}(2,2,2,acf,\emptyset) = \texttt{present}(1,4,2,acf,\emptyset)$
    - $\texttt{present}(2,2,2,acfg,\emptyset) = \texttt{present}(1,4,2,acfg,\emptyset)$
    - $\texttt{number of colors}(gh) \geqslant 2\,? \;\rightarrow\; \text{YES}$
  - $\texttt{present}(2,3,2,acfgh,\emptyset)$
    - $\texttt{present}(2,2,2,acfgh,\emptyset) = \texttt{present}(1,4,2,acfgh,\emptyset)$
    - $\texttt{present}(2,2,2,acfghi,\emptyset) = \texttt{present}(1,4,2,acfghi,\emptyset)$
    - $\texttt{number of colors}(ij) \geqslant 2\,? \;\rightarrow\; \text{NO}$
    - $\texttt{present}(1,4,2,acfghi,j)$
  - $\texttt{number of colors}(ghik) \geqslant 3\,? \;\rightarrow\; \text{NO}$
  - $\texttt{present}(1,4,2,acfgh,ik)$
- $\texttt{number of colors}(acfghl) \geqslant 5\,? \;\rightarrow\; \text{NO}$
- $\texttt{present}(2,4,2,acf,ghl)$
  - $\texttt{present}(2,3,2,acf,ghl)$
    - $\texttt{present}(2,2,2,acf,ghl) = \texttt{present}(1,4,2,acf,ghl)$
    - $\texttt{present}(2,2,2,acfm,ghl) = \texttt{present}(1,4,2,acfm,ghl)$
    - $\texttt{number of colors}(mn) \geqslant 2\,? \;\rightarrow\; \text{NO}$
    - $\texttt{present}(1,4,2,acfm,ghln)$
  - $\texttt{present}(2,3,2,acfmo,ghl)$
    - $\texttt{present}(2,2,2,acfmo,ghl) = \texttt{present}(1,4,2,acfmo,ghl)$
    - $\texttt{present}(2,2,2,acfmop,ghl) = \texttt{present}(1,4,2,acfmop,ghl)$
    - $\texttt{number of colors}(pq) \geqslant 2\,? \;\rightarrow\; \text{YES}$
  - $\texttt{number of colors}(mopq) \geqslant 3\,? \;\rightarrow\; \text{NO}$
  - $\texttt{present}(1,4,2,acfmo,ghlpq)$



FIGURE 8. An example run of $\texttt{present}(3,3,2,\emptyset,\emptyset)$. Vertices are presented by the respective recursive calls to $\texttt{present}(1,4,2,*,*)$ on the left. The relations $\supseteq$, $\between$ and $\|$ are illustrated as inclusion, overlap and disjointness of frames that start right above the corresponding vertices. Each recursive call to present returns the set of vertices presented during that call whose frames continue afterwards. This entire run of $\texttt{present}(3,3,2,\emptyset,\emptyset)$ returns the set $acfmor$, on which 5 colors have been used. The graph of $\between$ is an interval filament graph with $\omega = 3$.

Lemma 8.2. *Procedure* `present`(k, ℓ, m, A_1, A_2) *presents a set* S *and relations* $\Subset$, $\between$ *and* $\parallel$ *and returns a set* $R \subset S$ *so that the following conditions are satisfied:*

(i) $A_1 \Subset S$, $A_2 \between S$, *and* $x \parallel S$ *for any* $x \notin A_1 \cup A_2$ *that has been presented before* S,
(ii) *any* $x, y, z \in S$ *satisfy the conditions* (A1)–(A4) *of the definition of* $\mathsf{ABS}(k)$,
(iii) *any* $x, y \in S$ *satisfy the following conditions:*
  (R1) *if* $x \prec y$ *and* $x, y \in R$, *then* $x \Subset y$,
  (R2) *if* $x \Subset y$ *and* $y \in R$, *then* $x \in R$,
  (R3) *if* $x \parallel y$, *then* $x \in S \setminus R$,
(iv) *the graph defined on* S *by the relation* $\between$ *has clique number at most* k,
(v) *Algorithm has used at least* $\ell m^{k-2} - 1$ *colors on the vertices in* R.

Proof. First, note that the recursion in the procedure is finite, because every call to `present`(k, ℓ, m, A_1, A_2) makes recursive calls with k smaller by 1 or with k unchanged and ℓ smaller by 1.

The proof of the properties (i)–(v) goes by induction on k and ℓ. For $k = 1$, the conditions (i)–(v) hold trivially, while for $\ell = 2$, they follow directly from the induction hypothesis for $k-1$ and $2m$. Thus assume $k \geqslant 2$ and $3 \leqslant \ell \leqslant 2m$. Our call to `present` makes two or three recursive calls, in which sets of vertices S_1, S_2 and S_3 are presented (if there is no third recursive call, then let $S_3 = \emptyset$). Thus $A_1 \cup A_2 \prec S_1 \prec S_2 \prec S_3$ and $S = S_1 \cup S_2 \cup S_3$. The induction hypothesis (i) applied to the recursive calls implies (i) for S as well as the following:

$$(*) \qquad R_1 \Subset S_2 \cup S_3, \quad S_1 \setminus R_1 \parallel S_2 \cup S_3, \quad R_2 \between S_3, \quad S_2 \setminus R_2 \parallel S_3.$$

To show (ii) for S, choose any $x, y, z \in S$ with $x \prec y \prec z$. If $x, y, z \in S_i$, then all (A1)–(A4) follow directly from the induction hypothesis (ii) for the recursive calls. If $x \in S_i$ and $y \in S_j$ with $i < j$, then, by $(*)$, the relation between x and y is the same as the relation between x and z, whence all (A1)–(A4) follow. It remains to consider the case that $x, y \in S_i$ and $z \in S_j$ with $i < j$. To this end, we use $(*)$ and the induction hypothesis (iii) for the recursive calls.

(A1) Suppose $x \Subset y$ and $y \Subset z$. It follows from $y \Subset z$ and $(*)$ that $y \in R_1$ and $z \in S_2 \cup S_3$. This and $x \Subset y$ imply $x \in R_1$, by (R2). Hence $x \Subset z$, by $(*)$.
(A2) Suppose $x \Subset y$ and $y \between z$. It follows from $y \between z$ and $(*)$ that $y \in R_2$ and $z \in S_3$. This and $x \Subset y$ imply $x \in R_2$, by (R2). Hence $x \between z$, by $(*)$.
(A3) Suppose $x \between y$ and $y \Subset z$. It follows from $y \Subset z$ and $(*)$ that $y \in R_1$ and $z \in S_2 \cup S_3$. This and $x \between y$ imply $x \in S_1 \setminus R_1$, by (R1). Hence $x \parallel z$, by $(*)$.
(A4) If $x \parallel y$, then $x \in S_i \setminus R_i$, by (R3). This and $z \in S_j$ with $i < j$ imply $x \parallel z$, by $(*)$.

To show (iii) for R, choose any $x, y \in S$ with $x \prec y$. If $x, y \in S_i$, then all (R1)–(R3) follow directly from the induction hypothesis (iii) for the recursive calls and the fact that $R \cap S_i = R_i$ or $R \cap S_i = \emptyset$. It remains to consider the case that $x \in S_i$ and $y \in S_j$ with $i < j$. To this end, we use $(*)$ and the fact that the procedure `present` returns $R = R_1 \cup R_2$ or $R = R_1 \cup R_3$.

(R1) If $x, y \in R$, then $x \in R_1$ and $y \in R_j$, by the definition of R, so $x \Subset y$, by $(*)$.
(R2) If $x \Subset y$, then $x \in R_1$, by $(*)$, so $x \in R$, by the definition of R.
(R3) If $x \parallel y$, then $x \in S_i \setminus R_i$, by $(*)$, so $x \in S \setminus R$, by the definition of R.

We have $\omega(G[S]) = \max\{\omega(G[S_1]), \omega(G[S_2]), \omega(G[S_3]) + 1\} \leqslant k$, by $(*)$ and the property (R1) of R_2. Hence we have (iv) for S.

Finally, we show (v) for R. If Algorithm has used at least $\ell m^{k-2} - 1$ colors on $R_1 \cup R_2$, then the call returns $R = R_1 \cup R_2$, so (v) holds. It remains to consider the opposite case, that Algorithm has used at most $\ell m^{k-2} - 2$ colors on $R_1 \cup R_2$ and the call returns $R = R_1 \cup R_3$. By (v) for R_1 and R_2, Algorithm has used at least $(\ell-1)m^{k-2} - 1$ colors on each of R_1, R_2. It follows that at least $(\ell-2)m^{k-2}$ common colors have been used on both R_1 and R_2. By (v) for R_3, Algorithm has used at least $2m^{k-2} - 1$ colors on R_3. Since $R_2 \between R_3$, these colors must be different from the common colors used on both R_1 and R_2. Therefore, at least $\ell m^{k-2} - 1$ colors have been used on $R_1 \cup R_3$, which shows (v) for R. □

Proof of Lemma 8.1. We show that a run of `present(`k, $2m$, m, $\emptyset$, $\emptyset$`)` presents a graph G according to the rules of the game $\mathsf{ABS}(k)$ forcing Algorithm to use at least $2m^{k-1} - 1$ colors. We also show that the number of presentation scenarios for all possible responses of Algorithm is $2^{2^{O_k(m)}}$.

The conditions (ii), (iv) and (v) of Lemma 8.2 applied to the run of `present(`k, $2m$, m, $\emptyset$, $\emptyset$`)` imply that the presentation obeys the rules of the game $\mathsf{ABS}(k)$ and that Algorithm is forced to use at least $2m^{k-1} - 1$ colors. It remains to prove the second statement of the lemma.

The only conditional instruction in the procedure `present` whose result is not determined by the values of k, ℓ and m, but depends on the coloring chosen by Algorithm, is the test whether "Algorithm has used at least $\ell m^{k-2} - 1$ colors on $R_1 \cup R_2$". We call any execution of this instruction simply a *test*.

Let $s_{k,\ell}$ and $c_{k,\ell}$ denote the maximum number of vertices that can be presented and the maximum number of tests that can be performed, respectively, in a run of `present(`k, ℓ, m, A_1, A_2`)` including all its recursive subcalls. It easily follows from the procedure that

$$\begin{aligned} s_{1,\ell} &= 1, \qquad s_{k,2} = s_{k-1,2m} \quad \text{for } k \geqslant 2, \\ c_{1,\ell} &= 0, \qquad c_{k,2} = c_{k-1,2m} \quad \text{for } k \geqslant 2, \\ s_{k,\ell} &\leqslant 2s_{k,\ell-1} + s_{k-1,2m} \qquad \text{for } k \geqslant 2 \text{ and } 3 \leqslant \ell \leqslant 2m, \\ c_{k,\ell} &\leqslant 2c_{k,\ell-1} + c_{k-1,2m} + 1 \quad \text{for } k \geqslant 2 \text{ and } 3 \leqslant \ell \leqslant 2m. \end{aligned}$$

This yields the following by straightforward induction:

$$\begin{aligned} s_{1,2m} &= 1, \qquad s_{k,2m} \leqslant (2^{2m-1} - 1)s_{k-1,2m} \qquad \text{for } k \geqslant 2, \\ c_{1,2m} &= 0, \qquad c_{k,2m} \leqslant (2^{2m-1} - 1)(c_{k-1,2m} + 1) \quad \text{for } k \geqslant 2, \\ s_{k,2m} &\leqslant (2^{2m-1} - 1)^{k-1}, \\ c_{k,2m} &\leqslant (2^{2m-1})^{k-1} - 1. \end{aligned}$$

For fixed k and m, although the execution path of a run of `present(`k, $2m$, m, $\emptyset$, $\emptyset$`)` depends on the colors chosen by Algorithm, it is completely determined by the outcomes of the tests performed by the procedure `present`. A run of `present` performs at most $c_{k,2m}$ tests, so the number of its possible execution paths is at most $2^{c_{k,2m}}$. Each execution path gives rise to at most $s_{k,2m}$ presentation scenarios, each occurring after one of at most $s_{k,2m}$ vertices is presented. Therefore, the number of all presentation scenarios possible with this strategy is $2^{c_{k,2m}} s_{k,2m} = 2^{2^{O_k(m)}}$. □

Theorem 1.2 (3) now follows from Lemmas 8.1, 2.2 and 6.2.

The above yields a construction of string graphs with $\chi = \Theta_\omega((\log\log n)^{\omega-1})$ and $\chi_\omega = \Theta_\omega(\log\log n)$. In all their intersection models, some pairs of curves need to intersect many times. This is because these graphs contain vertices whose neighborhoods have chromatic number $\Theta_\omega((\log\log n)^{\omega-2})$, while the neighborhood of every vertex of an intersection graph of 1-intersecting curves (that is, curves any two of which intersect in at most one point) has bounded chromatic number [32]. We wonder whether there exists a construction of intersection graphs of 1-intersecting curves with bounded clique number and with chromatic number asymptotically greater than $\log\log n$.

Acknowledgment

We thank Martin Pergel for familiarizing us with subtree overlap graphs and interval filament graphs, their properties, and open problems related to them.

References

[1] Eyal Ackerman. On the maximum number of edges in topological graphs with no four pairwise crossing edges. *Discrete Comput. Geom.*, 41(3):365–375, 2009.

[2] Pankaj K. Agarwal, Boris Aronov, János Pach, Richard Pollack, and Micha Sharir. Quasi-planar graphs have a linear number of edges. *Combinatorica*, 17(1):1–9, 1997.

[3] Edgar Asplund and Branko Grünbaum. On a colouring problem. *Math. Scand.*, 8:181–188, 1960.

[4] Dwight R. Bean. Effective coloration. *J. Symb. Logic*, 41(2):289–560, 1976.

[5] James P. Burling. *On coloring problems of families of prototypes*. PhD thesis, University of Colorado, Boulder, 1965.

[6] Jérémie Chalopin, Louis Esperet, Zhentao Li, and Patrice Ossona de Mendez. Restricted frame graphs and a conjecture of Scott. submitted.

[7] Jessica Enright and Martin Pergel. Recognising the overlap graphs of subtrees of restricted trees is hard. submitted.

[8] Jessica Enright and Lorna Stewart. Subtree filament graphs are subtree overlap graphs. *Inform. Process. Lett.*, 104(6):228–232, 2007.

[9] Thomas Erlebach and Jiří Fiala. On-line coloring of geometric intersection graphs. *Comput. Geom.*, 23(2):243–255, 2002.

[10] Stefan Felsner. On-line chain partitions of orders. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 175(2):283–292, 1997.

[11] Jacob Fox and János Pach. Applications of a new separator theorem for string graphs. *Combin. Prob. Comput.*, 23(1):66–74, 2014.

[12] Fănică Gavril. The intersection graphs of subtrees in trees are exactly the chordal graphs. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 16(1):47–56, 1974.

[13] Fănică Gavril. Maximum weight independent sets and cliques in intersection graphs of filaments. *Inform. Process. Lett.*, 73(5–6):181–188, 2000.

[14] Martin C. Golumbic, Doron Rotem, and Jorge Urrutia. Comparability graphs and intersection graphs. *Discrete Math.*, 43(1):37–46, 1983.

[15] András Gyárfás. On the chromatic number of multiple interval graphs and overlap graphs. *Discrete Math.*, 55(2):161–166, 1985.

[16] András Gyárfás. Corrigendum: On the chromatic number of multiple interval graphs and overlap graphs. *Discrete Math.*, 62(3):333, 1986.

[17] András Gyárfás and Jenő Lehel. On-line and first fit colorings of graphs. *J. Graph Theory*, 12(2):217–227, 1988.

[18] Henry A. Kierstead and William T. Trotter. An extremal problem in recursive combinatorics. *Congr. Numer.*, 33:143–153, 1981.

[19] Alexandr Kostochka. On upper bounds for the chromatic numbers of graphs. *Trudy Inst. Mat.*, 10:204–226, 1988.

[20] Alexandr Kostochka. Coloring intersection graphs of geometric figures with a given clique number. In János Pach, editor, *Towards a Theory of Geometric Graphs*, volume 342 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 127–138. AMS, Providence, 2004.

[21] Alexandr Kostochka and Jan Kratochvíl. Covering and coloring polygon-circle graphs. *Discrete Math.*, 163(1–3):299–305, 1997.

[22] Alexandr Kostochka and Kevin Milans. Coloring clean and K_4-free circle graphs. In János Pach, editor, *Thirty Essays on Geometric Graph Theory*, pages 399–414. Springer, New York, 2012.

[23] Tomasz Krawczyk, Arkadiusz Pawlik, and Bartosz Walczak. Coloring triangle-free rectangle overlap graphs with $O(\log \log n)$ colors. *Discrete Comput. Geom.*, 53(1):199–220, 2015.

[24] László Lovász. Perfect graphs. In Lowell W. Beineke and Robin J. Wilson, editors, *Selected Topics in Graph Theory*, volume 2, pages 55–87. Academic Press, London, 1983.

[25] János Pach, Radoš Radoičić, and Géza Tóth. Relaxing planarity for topological graphs. In Ervin Győri, Gyula O.H. Katona, and László Lovász, editors, *More Graphs, Sets and Numbers*, volume 15 of *Bolyai Soc. Math. Stud.*, pages 285–300. Springer, Berlin, 2006.

[26] János Pach, Farhad Shahrokhi, and Mario Szegedy. Applications of the crossing number. *Algorithmica*, 16(1):111–117, 1996.

[27] Arkadiusz Pawlik, Jakub Kozik, Tomasz Krawczyk, Michał Lasoń, Piotr Micek, William T. Trotter, and Bartosz Walczak. Triangle-free geometric intersection graphs with large chromatic number. *Discrete Comput. Geom.*, 50(3):714–726, 2013.

[28] Arkadiusz Pawlik, Jakub Kozik, Tomasz Krawczyk, Michał Lasoń, Piotr Micek, William T. Trotter, and Bartosz Walczak. Triangle-free intersection graphs of line segments with large chromatic number. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 105:6–10, 2014.

[29] Martin Pergel. Recognition of polygon-circle graphs and graphs of interval filaments is NP-complete. In Andreas Brandstädt, Dieter Kratsch, and Haiko Müller, editors, *Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science (WG 2007)*, volume 4769 of *Lecture Notes Comput. Sci.*, pages 238–247. Springer, Berlin, 2007.

[30] Alexandre Rok and Bartosz Walczak. Outerstring graphs are χ-bounded. In Siu-Wing Cheng and Olivier Devillers, editors, *30th Annual Symposium on Computational Geometry (SoCG 2014)*, pages 136–143. ACM, New York, 2014.

[31] Daniel D. Sleator and Robert E. Tarjan. A data structure for dynamic trees. *J. Comput. System Sci.*, 26(3):362–391, 1983.

[32] Andrew Suk and Bartosz Walczak. New bounds on the maximum number of edges in k-quasi-planar graphs. In Stephen Wismath and Alexander Wolff, editors, *Graph Drawing (GD 2013)*, volume 8242 of *Lecture Notes Comput. Sci.*, pages 95–106. Springer, Berlin, 2013.

(Tomasz Krawczyk) Theoretical Computer Science Department, Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Science, Jagiellonian University, Kraków, Poland
E-mail address: krawczyk@tcs.uj.edu.pl

(Bartosz Walczak) Theoretical Computer Science Department, Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Science, Jagiellonian University, Kraków, Poland; School of Mathematics, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA
E-mail address: walczak@tcs.uj.edu.pl